

# EXTEMPOREANOUS SPEAKING

---

PEARSON AND HICKS



Class PN 4168

Book TP 4

Copyright N° \_\_\_\_\_

COPYRIGHT DEPOSIT.





# Extemporaneous Speaking

BY

PAUL M. PEARSON

PROFESSOR PUBLIC SPEAKING, SWARTHMORE COLLEGE

AND PHILIP M. HICKS

ASSISTANT IN PUBLIC SPEAKING, SWARTHMORE COLLEGE



HINDS, NOBLE & ELDREDGE

31-33-35 West 15th St.

New York City

PN + 168  
P+

Copyright, 1912, by Hinds, Noble & Eldredge

1824510  
21

© CLA 327410

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
Preface .....	5

### PART I

#### CHAPTER

I. Efficient Speaking .....	11
II. Preparing the Speech .....	17
III. The Introduction .....	23
IV. The Conclusion .....	32
V. The Discussion .....	37
VI. Personality .....	43
VII. After-Dinner Speaking .....	47
VIII. Speaking in Business .....	53

### PART II

#### SPEECHES FOR STUDY

The Ethics of Corporate Management.. <i>Charles W. Eliot</i>	59
The Principles of Business Success..... <i>Hugh Chalmers</i>	75
The Unknown Quantities..... <i>M. T. Frisbie</i>	81
Comparative Advertising Methods, East and West, <i>Hugh A. O'Donnell</i>	93
Vanadium Steels..... <i>Louis Bradford</i>	103
The Necessity for Adequate Railway Revenues, <i>Martin A. Knapp</i>	107
Hours of Service of Railway Employees, <i>Robert M. La Follette</i>	111

	PAGE
The Railway Rate Bill..... <i>Robert M. La Follette</i>	117
Alaska: The Nation's Storehouse . <i>Robert M. La Follette</i>	129
On Withdrawing from the Union..... <i>Jefferson Davis</i>	139
Paul Before Agrippa .....	143
Paul at Mars' Hill .....	147
Nathan's Parable of the Ewe Lamb .....	149
Tertullus' Speech Against Paul .....	151
Paul's Reply to Tertullus .....	153
Julia Ward Howe..... <i>Charles W. Eliot</i>	155
The Death of Lincoln..... <i>James A. Garfield</i>	161
The Bible and Progress..... <i>Woodrow Wilson</i>	163
International Conciliation..... <i>Nicholas Murray Butler</i>	179
Future in Chemistry..... <i>Wilder D. Bancroft</i>	187
The University is a Democracy. <i>Nicholas Murray Butler</i>	193
Inaugural Address..... <i>George E. Vincent</i>	197
The Delays and Defects in the Enforcement of Law in this Country..... <i>William Howard Taft</i>	211
The Indeterminate Sentence, the Parole, and the New Criminology..... <i>Frederick Howard Wines</i>	219
The Honor System..... <i>Jesse H. Holmes</i>	225
Jackson-Day Dinner..... <i>Woodrow Wilson</i>	227
The Issues of Reform..... <i>Woodrow Wilson</i>	241
After-Dinner Speech..... <i>Strickland W. Gillilan</i>	251
Appendix I, Synopsis .....	255
Appendix II, Topics for Speech .....	257
Appendix III, Extempore Speaking in High Schools....	263
Notes on Programs .....	265

## PREFACE

### FOR TEACHERS

**Extemporaneous Speaking.**—“Greater efficiency” has become the watchword of modern activity, and education in its various departments is shaping to that end. Courses in business management have made their way into the curriculum. The departments of economics, politics, and engineering being the quickest to respond to the popular trend toward practical rather than theoretical teaching, have reaped the greatest increase in enrollment. Extemporaneous Speaking has been the answer of the Public Speaking Department to this demand, and the results obtained have been successful both from the standpoint of the classroom and the interested co-operation of the other college departments.

As offered at Swarthmore, where it supplements already established courses in Declamation, Oratory and Argumentation, the aim of the course has been to enable men to talk shop effectively: that is, to equip the college student with the capacity for leadership that comes with the ability to impress one’s personality on other people by means of the spoken word. In all professions the thing that lifts an individual above his fellows is usually facility in self-expression. Leadership is the reward of the man who possesses the power of effective speech.

**Plan of Course.**—The object of the course being to train the student to talk effectively upon whatever touches him most nearly, two means to this end suggest themselves. First, to give the student a working knowledge of the structure and qualities of a successful speech. Second, to include in the course a maximum amount of practice. In other words, a laboratory course, not a lecture course.

**Small Sections.**—In pursuance of these aims it has been found necessary to divide the class into small sections of not more than ten students each. These sections meet one hour a week, when each student delivers a five-minute speech. Two or three longer speeches are also required during the semester.

**Topics for Speeches.**—Students are allowed the greatest possible freedom in selecting topics for speeches on condition that the subject be submitted for approval a week in advance of the delivery of the speech. A list of topics submitted by the heads of other college departments (*see Appendix 2*) is posted in the classroom, and students are encouraged to draw upon this source. College politics, athletics, student activities, and the various problems arising in connection with undergraduate life are frequently chosen, as are political, social, and scientific questions of current interest.

Whenever possible, engineering students are given separate sections, owing to the preponderance of technical subjects, which are of little interest to the other students.

**Teaching Method.**—It will be seen that there is comparatively little time allotted for actual instruction as such. The most satisfactory plan has been to reduce this phase of the course to the minimum required for a clear understanding of the principles of efficient speaking, and to rely upon the instructor's criticism of students' speeches to point out their successful employment. The criticism aims to be always constructive rather than destructive, to emphasize the merits of the speeches submitted rather than their shortcomings. A very definite advantage of the small section is that the instructor, by closer contact with the students, is able to know what variety and amount of criticism will produce the best results in individual cases. Too much may produce embarrassment, which is inimical to the best results.

At the close of each speech, wherever time permits, the class is encouraged to question the speaker upon any points of the speech, or to challenge his statements. The speaker is then allowed a few moments in rebuttal.

The subject matter which forms the basis of the instruction in this course will be found in Part I of this book and, briefly stated, treats of (I) Preparation of the speech, (II) Qualities of a successful speech, (III) Personality of the speaker, with additional chapters on the speech in business, and on after-dinner speaking.

No attempt is made in this course to develop an oratorical style or delivery. An easy, natural and

dignified delivery is commended; spontaneous gestures are encouraged; offensive mannerisms and striving for effect are deprecated.

**Holding the Interest.**—As in other laboratory courses, the best results can be obtained only when the students evince an active interest in the work. One of the problems of the instructor is to keep alive the interest, which is very general at the beginning of the course. The meeting week after week of the same small group of students to listen to the same familiar voices does not tend either to inspire the speaker or enthuse the listeners. This inevitable monotony should be counteracted by varying the program as much as possible. The routine of five-minute speeches may be broken by an informal debate, a round of toasts, a symposium upon some college topic, or a session devoted to salesmanship. Local conditions and knowledge of the class will suggest to the instructor other means of holding the interest, and he should be quick to seize upon every latent enthusiasm, to direct it to this end. Often a judicious assignment of topics may prove advantageous.

**Object of this Book.**—The material contained in Part I of this book embodies the teaching experience of the editors. The topics, the principles and the hints to students of public speaking are those which they have found useful in the classroom, and the *raison d'être* of the book is the need they have felt for a working text for the course in *Extempo-*

raneous Speaking, and the hope that it might prove useful to teachers working along similar lines.

Acknowledgment is made of the many valuable suggestions derived from the following works:

The Speech for Special Occasions, Knapp and French.

Effective Speaking, Arthur E. Phillips.

How to Attract and Hold an Audience, J. Berg Esenwein.

Psychology of Public Speaking, Walter Dill Scott.

The editors also desire to express their appreciation of the courtesy of the gentlemen who have permitted the use of their speeches in Part II. The speeches chosen have been, as far as possible, those of living men who are recognized as among the foremost thinkers and speakers of the present time, and it is hoped that they may prove valuable in stimulating classroom discussion, as well as in exemplifying the qualities of efficient public speaking.

Swarthmore, Pennsylvania, 1912.



# Extemporaneous Speaking

---

## PART I

---

### CHAPTER I

#### EFFICIENT SPEAKING

**Importance of the Subject.**—Because speech is a natural gift, because we employ it freely according to our needs or inclinations, and because the average person succeeds in conducting his affairs without giving any special attention to the subject, we are apt to lose sight of the opportunities for business success, for exerting influence, for leadership, which are offered to the man who has mastered the principles of efficient speaking. The term *efficient speaking* is in itself significant of the changing sentiment toward one of the oldest and most honorable of the arts, the art of public speech. In the forum and on the stage, the power of the spoken word has always been acknowledged, but only within recent years has there been a general recognition of the importance of effective speaking ability, both as a business asset and as a means of added usefulness

and power in every walk of life. This recognition is a part of the widespread striving for greater efficiency in all human activities, and the term *efficient speaking* is significant of this new and highly practical interest in public speaking, as contrasted with the older view, which identified it only with elocution and oratory.

To those whose profession demands constant employment of speech—the lawyer, the preacher, the teacher—the importance of ability in speaking should be apparent; yet how often does the plea fail, the sermon bore, or the lecture pall because the speaker cannot present effectively the matter which may have cost him the most painstaking effort! But to the non-professional speaker—the engineer, the farmer, the business man or woman—effective speaking ability is equally, if not so obviously, important. Distinction in any vocation can only come to the man who knows how to make his knowledge intelligible to others, and we frequently see the most thoughtful men yielding leadership to inferior men who can out-talk them.

**The Press and Speaking.**—The development of printing is partly responsible for the apparent decline of interest in the art of speech, yet at a second glance the press is revealed as a medium for the extension of the spoken word. We are not dependent upon the spoken word for information or for arguments; but for inspiration, nothing can take the place of it. A distinguished man speaks to a thousand persons upon some topic of public con-

cern, and the next morning his words are read by millions throughout the land.

**Press and Pulpit.**—What Newell Dwight Hillis says of the effect of the press upon the pulpit is true of all serious public speech. “Thoughtful men are not troubled lest some agency arise to dispossess the pulpit. In the last analysis preaching is simply an extension of that universal function called conversation. So far from books doing away with the influence of the voice, they seem rather to increase it. When a new book is published like ‘The Memories of Tennyson,’ or ‘Equality,’ or ‘The Christian,’ these books, instead of ending conversation upon the themes in question seem rather to open the flood-gates of speech so that a thousand readers break forth with discussion, who before were dumb.”

**The Platform.**—The public platform, the Chautauqua movement, and the University Extension work, all of which are increasing in importance and influence, each year offer exceptional opportunities to men who have a message for the public and the ability to speak it. Williams Jennings Bryan has perhaps the largest personal following of any man in the United States, which he has built up largely from the lecture platform by his spoken appeals to the people.

**The Cash Return.**—Now turning from the possibilities of leadership and preferment to the topic which more immediately concerns the college grad-

uate, it is asked: "Will training in public speaking better enable a man to get a job?" Mr. Allen Davis, Professor of Public Speaking in the University of Pittsburgh, in an address before the Public Speaking Conference at Swarthmore College in 1910 offered this striking testimony in support of the conclusion that it would. He said in part:

**In Business.**—"The director of the High School in Pittsburgh, one of the most commercial cities in the world, sent out a circular letter to every business firm of consequence in the city, asking those firms, what in their opinion, was the most important thing we could teach students in order to enable them to grapple more successfully with the problems that would await them in the business world. With a few exceptions, the answers that he got did not say, 'Teach them more arithmetic,' or 'Teach them more stenography.' In fact, ninety-nine per cent of those business firms laid stress upon the advantage of being able to write and speak the English tongue accurately and forcibly! Let us mark this bit of testimony Exhibit 1.

**In Engineering.**—"Now for Exhibit 2. The Chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh recently had a meeting with a body of engineers, and asked them what they considered to be the most important part of a college career. Their answer may seem strange to you, but I quote it exactly as it was given. 'We presuppose,' said these gentlemen, 'that graduates of an engineering school will have some

knowledge of the principles of their profession; but you, Mr. Chancellor, cannot emphasize too strongly the advantage that accrues to men from the ability to think upon their feet; to express extempore a well-thought-out proposition; to adapt themselves and their conversation instantaneously to changing conditions as they may arise. We value this ability of clear and rapid thinking and expression more highly than almost anything else.' Let us mark this bit of testimony Exhibit 2.

**In Salesmanship.**—“Now for Exhibit 3. The general manager of an international business house which employs thousands of salesmen, recently said to me, ‘I never can get enough men for the more important positions of the firm, because there are so very few men who can present their own arguments clearly and overcome the arguments of the other side without giving offence. At the present time I have three positions paying \$5,000 a year each, and I am unable to find a man of personality who has the qualifications that I have indicated.’ But seriously different as these three points may seem on their face, is there not at the bottom an underlying unity to all of them? What does ‘writing and speaking the mother tongue well’ mean but the conveying thought clearly and powerfully—to persuade? What does ‘thinking on one’s feet and adapting one’s case to the case of the other man’ mean but the skilful presentation of facts—in order to persuade? And what does ‘an ability to meet the case of the opponent without giving offence’

mean but convincing refutation in order to persuade? Is not persuasion of one sort or another, whether it be to present facts that they may be accepted, or to induce a mood in the mind of the reader to correspond to that of the writer, at the basis of all language; and how much more at the basis of all spoken language, and above all, of oratory, which has for its fundamental object the moving of bodies of men to action as the speaker directs them."

**Scope of This Course.**—The course in Extemporaneous Speaking is designed, not to supplant, but to supplement, the courses in Oratory and Argumentation. It is planned especially to meet the needs of the non-professional or informal speaker who desires to cultivate facility in clear, convincing and effective expression, whether in private conversation, in business, or in any of the social, political, or professional organizations with which he may be connected.

The distinction between extemporaneous and impromptu speaking should be clear at the outset. The former in no wise implies a lack of preparation on the part of the speaker, but designates that broad field of public speech which lies just without the confines of the formal oration, sermon, legal address, or platform lecture. The chapters that follow are especially designed to aid in the preparation of speeches for the wide range of informal occasions that present themselves constantly to educated men.

## CHAPTER II

### PREPARING THE SPEECH

**Three Methods.**—There are three ways of preparing a speech that are in general use by successful speakers. The first is to write it out and to memorize it or familiarize one's self with it by frequent rehearsals. The second is to prepare an outline or plan, and to practice the speech from these notes until a reasonable grasp of it is obtained. The third is to divide the subject mentally and to trust to the inspiration of the occasion for the most effective phrasing. The last method, while allowing the most freedom and spontaneity to the speaker who is able to read his audience accurately and to take instant advantage of their moods, is not recommended to inexperienced speakers. For classroom work, the second is undoubtedly the safest and most valuable method for the student, although writing out the speech in full may be helpful to those afflicted with nervousness. Whichever method is chosen, the introduction and conclusion of the speech should be definitely phrased and committed, for those are the places at which embarrassment and hesitation are most likely to overtake the novice, and at which a "break" is most damaging to the success of the speech.

**Value of Preparation.**—A story is told of President George E. Vincent, of the University of Minnesota, who being listed for a toast at an alumni dinner, determined to be ready for whatever pleasantries the toastmaster might perpetrate in introducing him, and to this end, prepared no less than eight tentative introductions to his own speech. The result of this forethought was one of the most notable and delightful speeches in the history of the association.

William Dean Howells, writing of Mark Twain's methods, says: "He knew that from the beginning of oratory the orator's spontaneity was for the silence and solitude of the closet where he mused his words to an imaginary audience; that this was the use of orators from Demosthenes and Cicero up and down. He studied every word and syllable. He studied every tone and gesture, and he forecast the result with the real audience from its result on the imagined audience. Therefore it was beautiful to see him and to hear him. He rejoiced in the pleasure he gave, and in the blows of surprise he dealt, and, because he had his end in mind, he knew where to stop."

More significant testimony as to the value of careful preparation can hardly be imagined.

**Choosing the Subject.**—Usually the subject is determined by the occasion, but where this is not the case, the speaker should none the less consider the occasion and the probable audience in choosing his topic. For classwork the range of possible subjects

is almost unlimited, with this caution: Do not select topics concerning which you have no previous knowledge or interest. A speech should impress your own personality upon the subject. A mere report of some one else's ideas is not the desideratum.

**First Steps.**—Having decided upon a subject the first thing to do is to think over and reduce to logical form what you already know and believe about it. This is essential. Even though your subsequent reading and study may completely alter your first opinions or ideas, the possession at the outset of a definite viewpoint will illuminate your investigation and make it of real value to you, besides doubling the probability of your making an entertaining and convincing speech.

A complete mastery of the subject is essential to intelligent speaking. The speaker's concern should be to select the most important out of the mass of material at hand. Moreover, for a ten-minute speech he should have enough material for a half-hour. There is no more effective cure for nervousness and lack of confidence than to have more than enough ammunition in reserve, so that you cannot be disconcerted by a random question.

**Theme and Purpose.**—The selection of material to be used out of the mass in hand will naturally take the form of a narrowing of the general subject to some particular phase or theme which will be determined by the speaker's purpose. Authorities

differ very widely in the matter of classifying speeches according to their kinds or to the purposes in speaking, but the differences are mainly a matter of terminology, some preferring to adopt the terms of psychology, others to group according to the ends sought by the speaker. Inasmuch as the speaker may need, in arousing the audience to action, for example, to appeal to two or more of the psychological functions of the mind, such as the imagination and the reason, the latter method seems less confusing, and will be adopted in this text. The speaker's purpose then will be either Clearness, Acceptance, Action, or Entertainment.

**Four Ends of Speech.**—*Clearness*: Here the speaker is concerned simply to convey to the audience a definite picture of the subject in hand, whether it be a nebula, a propaganda, or a gas engine. His appeal is to the understanding; and both subject-matter and phrasing must be selected to that end.

*Acceptance* involves a step farther than clearness. The audience must not only discern what is in the speaker's mind, but they must approve it and adopt it as their own. In working for acceptance the speaker may appeal either to the reason by argument or to the sentiments by persuasion—or to both, as is the usual practice, because the average audience contains about an even proportion of persons dominated by reason or sentiment.

*Action* goes beyond acceptance and involves an

appeal to the emotions or to the impelling motives—patriotism, ambition, self-preservation, honor, etc. It is the most important and most difficult of the four ends, and in a measure embraces them all. To rouse to action the speaker must be lucid, persuasive, interesting, convincing, and finally his plea must be virile.

*Entertainment:* To be successful, all speeches should entertain; that is to say, the speaker must never lose sight of the importance of interestingness as a quality of discourse. But we must distinguish between entertainingness as a quality and as an end. In the latter case it constitutes amusement, and the speaker's appeal is to the imagination, the fancy, and the sense of humor, which necessitates a different treatment of the subject.

Having decided upon one of these four ends, the speaker will adopt the theme best suited to attain the desired end, and will be ready to begin the actual preparation of the speech, the divisions of which—the introduction, the discussion, and the conclusion—are treated in the following chapters.

**Studying the Audience.**—Not less important than thorough preparation is the study of human nature, to enable the speaker to read his audience, to know what testimony will convince them, when a point is accepted, when further proof is needed, and how to redeem a speech that is not going well. There are no rules to make this task easy. Constant watch-

22 EXTEMPORANEOUS SPEAKING

fulness and the will to profit by experience will alone avail to develop one's natural powers in this direction. For one thing, thorough preparation in advance will leave the speaker freer to watch his hearers and to note his effect upon them.

## CHAPTER III

### THE INTRODUCTION

**Functions.**—The opening moments of the speech are the most embarrassing to the inexperienced speaker, and at the same time the most momentous. The sea of upturned faces is filled with imaginary terrors for the novice and he may easily wreck his craft if it is not well ballasted by preparation and confidence. In these crucial moments the speaker has what he may later have to strive for, the attention of his audience. A position of leadership is accorded him; the minds of his auditors are attentive and alert, ready to follow him.

In return for their attention they have a right to demand of the speaker certain definite things. First, that he have something to say to them; second, that he say it clearly and interestingly; third, that his bearing be dignified, courteous, and genial. All of which things must be unmistakably indicated in the opening remarks. The function of the introduction then is threefold.

1. To establish friendly relations between speaker and audience.
2. To establish relationship between audience and subject.
3. To state clearly the purpose of the speaker.

**Speaker and the Audience.**—Almost every audience, like all Gaul, is divided into three parts—the friendly, the indifferent, and the hostile. The discreet speaker will gauge the situation and endeavor to determine how much consideration he must accord to each faction in order to fuse the whole audience into a body sufficiently interested and well disposed to follow his discourse to the end.

Where the friendly element predominates, the speaker need lose no time on this function. Where indifference or hostility is the prevailing feeling a serious effort must be made to allay it and supplant it with tolerance or interest. The attitude of the speaker becomes one of conciliation. He is willing to concede certain things to the opposition, and in return appeals to their sense of fair play. No better example of a successful introduction of this nature can be found than in Henry Ward Beecher's famous address in Liverpool, October 16, 1863. Popular sympathy in England at the time was strongly with the Southern cause, and Beecher found the towns placarded against him and the audiences violently hostile. In the Liverpool address, after discussing free speech briefly, he said:

“Now, personally, it is a matter of very little consequence to me whether I speak here to-night or not. (Laughter and cheers.) But one thing is very certain: if you do permit me to speak here to-night, you will hear some very plain talking. (Applause and hisses.) You will not find me a man that dared to speak about Great Britain three thousand miles off, and then is afraid to

speak to Great Britain when he stands on her shores. (Immense applause and hisses.) And if I do not mistake the tone and temper of Englishmen, they had rather have a man who opposes them in a manly way than a sneak that agrees with them in an unmanly way. (Bravo.) Now, if I can carry you with me by sound convictions, I shall be immensely glad, but if I cannot carry you with me by facts and sound arguments, I do not wish you to go with me at all; and all that I ask is simply *fair play*." (Applause and a voice: "You shall have it, too.")

**The Audience and the Subject.**—With an audience wholly friendly, the speaker may, at his discretion, omit this function of the introduction and trust to making the speech as a whole sufficiently striking and interesting. But instances are comparatively few where friendliness expresses itself in enthusiasm. Indeed, the majority of questions which we discuss in our every-day affairs elicit but a mild mental assent without any stirring to affirmative action. Hence if action is the end sought, the speaker may do well to proceed as though his entire audience were indifferent to the subject.

Indifference in an audience usually grows out of a distaste for being bored. And if it is possible to define so multiplex an experience as being bored we may say that this sensation, so far as audiences are concerned, usually arises when the subject touches neither their experience nor their interest, or is presented in an unauthoritative or uninteresting manner. It will be noted that our definition is

in negative terms, from which the speaker may deduce that the antidote will be positive—vigorous and striking.

Boldness, sincerity, and geniality will go a long way toward securing the attention of indifferent listeners; and if in addition the speaker can impress upon them the importance of the subject to them as individuals or as a body he may proceed with his serious arguments with reasonable assurance of an attentive hearing. A few striking and original phrases, a well-chosen illustration, a hint of the unusual—any device that will present a familiar topic in a new guise and make it personal and vital—will dispel indifference, the greatest obstacle a speaker has to overcome.

Where hostility toward the subject is manifest, it must be met by concession, as in the case of hostility toward the speaker, and the speaker must establish some common ground from which they can approach gradually the things which cause division. William Jennings Bryan almost habitually begins his address by laying down some broad generalization from the Constitution or the Scriptures, which every one accepts, and then proceeds to develop from it the viewpoint he seeks to establish in the minds of his auditors. Beecher, in his Liverpool speech already quoted, had to overcome violent antagonism to his subject as well as to himself. Some speakers prefer to meet opposition in a fighting spirit and rely upon their mettle to win through.

**Statement of Purpose.**—Occasionally a speaker is heard who is so zealous to be fair-minded and impartial that the audience is kept playing at hide and seek with his real viewpoint in a jungle of bewilderingly vague generalizations. If you have a purpose in speaking—which is your only excuse for speaking—you will save both time and effort by taking the audience into your confidence at the outset. If you are arguing for universal arbitration, *argue for it*. Let your purpose be known at the start. Later on you may treat the other side as judicially as you please, but first be sure that you have implanted in the minds of the audience a definite conception of your own purpose. Occasionally, of course, your object may be best attained by indirection—as in Mark Anthony's oration over the body of Cæsar—but such occasions are exceptional; they seldom occur with the non-professional speaker.

With these functions of the introduction in mind it is worth while to examine the speeches of men successful in leading human thought, to see what forms the opening remarks may take. Any rigid classification is impossible because the combination of subject and occasion, and the personality and the style of the speaker conduce to an infinite variety. An examination of the speeches included in this volume will make it evident that there are certain types or forms which are most frequently used and are generally effective. Knapp and French in their handbook, "The Speech for Special Occasions,"

classify these common types as Personal, General, Illustrative, and the Anecdote.

**The Personal Introduction.**—This is the most common type of introduction, and if kept within the bounds of sincerity and modesty is one of the easiest and safest ways of getting in touch with an audience. In it the speaker has an opportunity at once to express his gratification at the privilege or honor accorded him, and to deprecate his ability; also to win the cordiality of the audience by paying his tribute of respect to the organization, or whatever agency may have called the meeting together. Care must be taken not to violate good taste either by overpraise or over-humility. The personality of the speaker should be merged in the occasion and not exalted above it. We have no better example of a graceful introduction than the second paragraph from Henry W. Grady's oration on The New South delivered before the New England Society.

"Let me express to you my appreciation of the kindness by which I am permitted to address you. I make this abrupt statement advisedly, for I feel that if, when I raise my provincial voice in this ancient and august presence, I could find courage for no more than the opening sentence, it would be well if in that instance I had met in a rough sense my obligation as a guest, and had perished, so to speak, with courtesy on my lips and grace in my heart.

"Permitted through your kindness to catch my second wind, let me say that I appreciate the significance of being the first Southerner to speak

at this board, which bears the substance, if it surpasses the semblance, of the original New England's hospitality, and honors a sentiment that in turn honors you, in which my personality is lost and the compliment to my people made plain."

For other examples of this type, see Paul's Address before Agrippa (*page* 143), Woodrow Wilson's speech on "The Bible and Progress" (*page* 163), Charles W. Eliot's Eulogy of Julia Ward Howe (*page* 155).

**The General Introduction.**—The general beginning is more formal than the personal introduction, and is more frequently used in speeches of dedication and presentation, or when the occasion, not the speaker, is the important affair. It will begin by discussing the significance of such occasions or subjects in general, and proceed thence naturally to the specific occasion or theme. For variations of this type read Woodrow Wilson's address on "The Issues of Reform" (*page* 241), and F. H. Wines' on "The New Criminology" (*page* 219).

**The Illustrative Introduction.**—The speaker desirous of fixing a certain viewpoint in the mind of his hearers can frequently do so more effectively by some well-chosen illustration or comparison than by simple statement of his own. To be an illustration in any real sense the figure employed must involve things that are known by that audience. The comparison, if made, must be to something

familiar. Quotations and illustrations from History, Science, or the Arts frequently combine the advantages of familiarity and authenticity, and are doubly effective. Nicholas Murray Butler begins his speech at the inaugural exercises at the University of Virginia (*page* 193) with a reference to one of the familiar dialogues of Plato.

**The Anecdote.**—If well told and pertinent, an anecdote gives the speaker a splendid start, but if poorly told it imposes a tremendous handicap. Suggestions concerning the telling of stories are found elsewhere in this book. In deciding upon an introduction of this nature, the speaker must consider his own ability. If it is not a dependable quantity he had far better risk his anecdotes in the main body of the speech, where a failure to secure a laugh has not quite so damaging an effect.

**Introduction for a Technical Speech.**—When a professional man is addressing members of his own profession his choice of introduction will be governed by the same motives as apply to any other speech. But the occasion frequently occurs when the professional man must talk to laymen and when his technical vocabulary is not intelligible to his audience. Salesmen selling goods, engineers, and architects presenting plans to committees or boards, specialists who have occasion to interest a mixed audience find these functions added to the other requirements of the introduction:

1. To make clear the general scope or purpose of the subject.
2. To make it vital by comparison with familiar things, or by setting forth its advantages in terms of utility, economy, or comfort.
3. To define such essential principles as will enable the audience to grasp the subject as a whole as the speech proceeds with its development.

The speech on "Vanadium Steels" (*page* 103), given by a student in the classroom at Swarthmore, is opened effectively in accordance with these principles.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE CONCLUSION

**Purpose of the Conclusion.**—The closing paragraphs of the extemporaneous speech, while not so formal as the peroration in oratory nor as logically exacting as the summary in debate, have yet a very definite relation to the speech as a whole, and an essential function to perform. The conclusion is necessary to give final emphasis to the theme, to fix it in the minds of the auditors, and having done this, to enable the speaker to take leave of them gracefully while their interest is at flood-tide. He has presented his case, drawn his picture, or pleaded his cause, as may be. Nothing new is to be added. The audience must not be wearied by repetition, yet something is needed to drive the argument home—something brief, vivid, striking, that will send the audience away with the speaker's thought strongly impressed and with the satisfied feeling that comes from hearing a clear and interesting discourse forcefully and happily concluded.

The attention quickens involuntarily when the audience senses the approaching end, and the speaker must be prepared to turn this quickening to his advantage in pressing home his thought.

**Qualities of the Conclusion.**—To fulfil these purposes, the conclusion must have certain definite qualities, the foremost of which are brevity, force, and appropriateness. Brevity is the *sine qua non* of the successful ending. Do not multiply your phrases however they may please your own ears. An audience disappointed of an anticipated termination quickly grows impatient and restive. Do not be tempted by the seeming opportunity to add just one thought more. Deliver your conclusion as you have planned it, and leave the audience satisfied but not satiated.

Force is essential to the success of the conclusion. The audience expects a climax. The speaker should feel the necessity of it. Yet many thoughtful speeches are weakened by a lame and halting conclusion both as to voice and sentiment. Confidence and conviction beget like qualities in the audience, and should be dominant characteristics of the closing paragraph.

Appropriateness is the final test of a good conclusion. The closing paragraph must be in keeping with the body of the speech, which effect is most readily attained by having the purpose of the speech clearly in mind when planning the conclusion. If the discussion is simple, personal and direct, a sudden turning to the grand, sublime, and reverential style is almost certain to produce an anticlimax. If clearness is the end sought, if the speech is an exposition, a narrative, or deals with technical or scientific subjects, the conclusion will appropriately be

used to intensify the mental picture of the situation, conditions, laws, or mechanisms that have been discussed. If the effort has been to win conviction, or rouse to action, a more impassioned style in closing will be justified. Whatever the purpose in speaking, the conclusion should seem to be the natural and logical ending to the train of ideas presented.

The conclusion must conclude.

**Forms of the Conclusion.**—In closing, as in beginning the speech, the speaker is not limited by fixed forms or rules, but may employ that kind of conclusion which seems best adapted to the subject, to the occasion, or to his style and purpose in speaking. Knapp and French classify the most frequently used types as the Personal, the Summary, the Hortatory ending, and the Quotation. A study of the speeches in Part II will disclose examples of these types, and show how they may be varied or combined to suit the purpose of the speaker.

**The Personal Ending.**—The personal ending is employed when the speaker feels that his climax is too abrupt to serve as a leave-taking, or when the occasion seems to require the addition of a few personal words. A brief appreciation of the courtesy or patience shown him, and an expression of his pleasure in speaking, serve this purpose admirably. Often, too, the speaker may make his sincerity felt by employing his closing words to express his personal tribute or conviction.

Professor Bancroft, in his speech on "The Future

of Chemistry" (*page* 187), uses a combination of the personal ending with the summary.

**The Summary.**—The informal speech does not require the exact summary that is used in debate, but in modification it is one of the safest and most forceful methods for the inexperienced speaker. The aim must be to sum up what the speech has attempted to convey, not the particular step or arguments employed. This is well illustrated in the conclusion of M. T. Frisbie's speech on "The Unknown Quantities" (*page* 81). The aim must be to present the gist of the speech in a striking way; an epigram or a paraphrased proverb or quotation will linger in the hearer's mind after specific arguments have faded.

**Hortatory Ending.**—This is the natural ending for all persuasive speeches, wherein the speaker seeks to arouse the emotions of the audience or to secure their action, although it is by no means confined to this one type of speech.

The study of the following examples will reveal its effectiveness under widely varying conditions:

Woodrow Wilson's address at the Jackson Day Dinner (*page* 227).

Nicholas Murray Butler at the Lake Mohonk Conference (*page* 179).

Nicholas Murray Butler at the University of Virginia (*page* 193).

**Illustration.**—Under this head we may group the quotation, the allusion, and the general illustration,

through their common function of strengthening the speaker's presentation by associating it with familiar and accepted things and with the thoughts of men of established position and authority.

President Vincent's Inaugural Address (*page 197*) concludes with a combination of the hortatory ending and a quotation from Goethe which happily expresses the broad ideas of the speech.

Ex-President Eliot, of Harvard, in his tribute to Julia Ward Howe (*page 155*), makes graceful employment of her own lines in concluding.

Robert M. La Follette, in his speech in the United States Senate on the Railway Rates Bill (*page 117*), reenforces his general contention by a quotation from Daniel Webster.

**Preparation.**—Whatever form of conclusion may be chosen by the speaker, it should be carefully phrased in advance and in some cases even committed to memory. The assurance that comes from the knowledge that one has at his tongue's end a forceful and adequate conclusion contributes greatly to the confidence and effectiveness of the informal speaker.

## CHAPTER V

### THE DISCUSSION

**Importance.**—Important as are the beginning and the ending, it remains that the speech itself is the thing. The impression made by the speaker will depend ultimately upon the quality and the delivery of the main body of the speech. We have shown that the introduction and conclusion serve their important purposes, but excellence in these two divisions must in no sense be considered a disguise for poverty of thought or slovenly presentation throughout the speech itself.

**The Speaker's Problem.**—Assuming adequate mental preparation, the speaker's part is to get his material across the footlights; to make his hearers see the thing as he sees it; to accept what he has accepted; to be moved as he is moved. A mere statement of fact or opinion is not sufficient. Every audience contains persons of widely varying degrees of intelligence, information, and opinion, and the speaker is to bring them all to one viewpoint, his own. He must foresee these differences when planning his speech; must endeavor to foresee what points the audience will find difficult of acceptance, and must elaborate these. He must consider that a

statement which is almost axiomatic to one part of his audience may seem only crass assertion to another.

Efficiency in speaking involves carrying the audience with one through difficulties and across obstacles, not in running a spectacular race and distancing the field.

**Assertion; Four Kinds of Support.**—Whatever the purpose of the speech, whatever the subject or theme, the statement of it in the first instance will be mere assertion, and it becomes the business of the speaker to support these assertions.

Professor Arthur E. Phillips, in his book, "Effective Speaking," makes the following analysis of the four forms of support, which he defines as Restatement, General Illustration, Specific Instance, and Testimony:

"We say (assertion) 'Greece had great men,' and continue, 'She had master minds.' This is Restatement; we have said the same thing over again in different words. We go on, 'She had orators, philosophers, poets.' This is a General Illustration. We have supported the assertion by presenting some of its general features. We proceed, 'She had Demosthenes, Plato, Homer, etc.' This is Specific Instance. We have strengthened our original assertion by actual cases. Finally, we say, 'Macaulay says: "Her intellectual empire is imperishable." ' This is Testimony. We have supported our assertion by corroboration. It will now be clear that the great task of the speaker who would be effective in the professional, social or business field is the develop-

ment of judgment in respect as to when an assertion needs support, and the kind and degree of support demanded."

The example given is merely illustrative of the use of the four forms of support, and is not intended as a model. Few statements need such elaborate defense. Ordinarily, one or two of the four will afford ample support, Restatement and Specific Instance being most commonly used.

**Qualities of the Discussion.**—While it is both impossible and undesirable to prescribe definite forms to be followed in planning the discussion, there are certain qualities which an analysis of successful speeches reveals as being essential. These are Unity, Sequence, Clearness, Force, Elegance, and Appeal.

**Unity.**—The principle of unity requires that the speaker shall stick to his theme. Unity can be insured only by a careful planning of the speech in advance. Unity means no digressions that do not directly strengthen the argument, and no favorite stories or quotations that do not illustrate the case in point. The impromptu speaker is likely to violate the principle of unity owing to the lack of perspective, which leads him to over-elaborate trivial details. Read the speech of Jefferson Davis "On Withdrawing from the Union" (*page* 139), and notice how inevitable each successive thought is to the progress of the speech.

*Sequence.*—Logical arrangement or sequence of the material enables the audience to follow the argument more readily than when the speaker chases his theme from pillar to post. In arguing from past to future, from cause to effect, or effect to cause, in description or narration, the speaker should have his end clearly in view and arrange his material at the outset so that each step shall carry him nearer the goal. Each point should be established in turn, the speech progressing smoothly and logically toward an inevitable conclusion. Examine these speeches in Part II, and notice their structure:

“Ethics of Corporate Management,” by Charles W. Eliot (*page* 59).

“The Unknown Quantities in Advertising,” by M. T. Frisbie (*page* 81).

*Clearness.*—The importance of clearness cannot be overestimated. Words and phrasing should convey exactly the shade of meaning intended. How futile to build an elaborate argument upon a premise that is misunderstood by the audience! Vague phrases must be avoided; the minds of the listeners must be held to the topic by specific illustrations. An audience cannot turn back a page to clear up a doubtful point, but must grasp the idea as it is spoken, a fact which the speaker should bear in mind when preparing his speech.

All of the speeches of Robert M. La Follette, in Part II, are notably clear, owing to the speaker’s unerring instinct for the right word.

*Force*.—Many a speech, otherwise excellent, fails to convince because it lacks the forceful qualities which are requisite to impress and hold the minds of the auditors. Psychology teaches that attention travels in waves, not in straight lines, and the speaker must plan to ride the crest of each wave. This means that there must be light and shade in the matter of emphasis, on both material and delivery. Striking phrases and illustrations, varied sentence-structure, questions asked and answered, will all contribute to forcefulness. Let the speech be a vigorous expression of personality; the various devices will then fall into almost unconscious employment.

Woodrow Wilson's speech, "The Bible and Progress" (*page* 163) is an excellent example of the forceful treatment of a familiar theme.

*Elegance*.—Elegance of diction distinguishes the great from the mediocre orator, and while the non-professional speaker may have little use for the oratorical style, he should recognize that distinction in speech is an advantage worth striving for. Grammar and pronunciation should be above reproach, and a careful study of the principles of rhetoric will repay the average speaker many times over.

George E. Vincent's "Inaugural Address" (*page* 197) and Nicholas Murray Butler's "The University is a Democracy" (*page* 193) are illustrative of the distinction conferred by elegance in style and diction.

*Appeal.*—Finally, the speech must be interesting to the very people for whom it is intended. It must appeal to *them*, to *their* reason, sentiments, understanding, or humor. To give it this factor of personal interest the speaker must connect the ideas he seeks to establish with things already known and accepted by the audience. In every mind there is a wealth of knowledge gathered from previous experiences—facts, impressions, sensations, and opinions. These are materials to hand for the speaker. If he is clever enough to select his illustrations and evidence from the things already accepted, his speech will appeal to the listeners in a way that will go far toward success.

## CHAPTER VI

### PERSONALITY

**Winning Personality.**—A winning personality is the open sesame to the good will of an audience. The speaker who, like William Jennings Bryan, steps before his auditors with a commanding presence, greeting them with a genial smile and including every one present in a sympathetic glance, has half won his battle before beginning to speak. The audience warms towards such a man and settles back comfortably, confident that they will like him, and be interested in what he has to say. Such personality in its highest type is born in the man; what the audience gets is merely the outward reflection of the nature and disposition of the speaker who stands before them.

**Cultivating Personality.**—Those less fortunately gifted can successfully cultivate a pleasing presence by observing in others the qualities which produce a pleasing effect and by criticizing themselves for any deficiency in this respect. Study, analyze the effect that distinguished speakers have upon you, and ascertain what qualities contribute to it.

**Geniality.**—Foremost among the elements of a winning personality is that overflowing of good

nature and good humor which we term geniality. The speaker should like his audience. He should desire to be friends with them and to carry them with him amicably. The old saying that like begets like is very true of the correspondence in feeling between speaker and audience.

**Dignity.**—In cultivating geniality, the good taste of the speaker must warn him not to overstep the bounds of self-respect. He must present a dignified bearing. Any cheapness, vulgarity, or servility; any conscious playing down to the audience will inevitably displease them and react unfavorably upon the speaker.

**Earnestness.**—Earnestness must be the guarantee that the speaker is not talking against time. Earnestness should comprise about equal parts of sincerity and enthusiasm. The speaker who is enthusiastic in his convictions will be earnest in his bearing. Earnestness is his tribute to the sincerity of the audience. Flippancy, familiarity, and superficiality are to be avoided when the occasion is serious.

**Originality.**—This, above all, “to thine own self be true.” We do not go to hear speakers with the same motive with which we turn to our encyclopedias, to find out the recorded knowledge of the matter in hand. What we seek is the speaker’s own mind and belief and knowledge, and the reaction of his personality on the subject. Serious and thorough thinking upon the topic under dis-

cussion will give the speaker a poise and power that will be quickly sensed by the audience. The attention quickens involuntarily when challenged by a personality exhibiting both authority and originality.

**Mental Bearing.**—Without dilating upon the relations existing between physical attitude and mental bearing, we may say that both should exhibit the four qualities that contribute to the winning personality: Geniality, dignity, earnestness, and originality. All four should be reflected alike in the speaker's mind, manner, and method.

**Delivery.**—The manner of delivery of any form of public discourse is appropriately determined by its style. Oratory and Argumentation have special requirements which cannot be considered under the head of Extemporaneous Speaking. The distinguishing features of the extempore speech should be simplicity, spontaneity, and directness, from which it follows that the delivery of the speech should exhibit much of the freedom of dignified and serious conversation. The occasion itself will exercise a controlling influence on the delivery. Most non-professional speakers err on the side of undue formality in their occasional efforts. Not being accustomed to facing an audience and reading its moods, but impressed by the necessity of a serious effort, their style is often stilted and clogged with bookish phrases acquired from ill-digested reading.

Speak clearly, correctly, and confidently; articu-

late distinctly, that you may be heard; and for the rest, remember that you are talking to each member of your audience personally and directly, and that it is necessary that each one shall hear and understand you.

Indistinctness, nasality, unpleasant mannerisms, and colloquialisms are to be avoided. The conversational tone does not excuse carelessness in diction, nor in pronunciation or rhetoric.

Gestures should be used without hesitation whenever the inclination to gesture arises spontaneously from the earnestness of the speaker or the demands of his speech. Studied or conscious effect in gesture has, however, little excuse in informal speaking.

## CHAPTER VII

### AFTER-DINNER SPEAKING

**The After-Dinner Speech.**—With the exception of pulpit oratory, the after-dinner speech is probably the most widely practiced form of public speaking in America. Organizations of every description—social, political, commercial, fraternal, and literary—all have adopted the banquet with its attendant speech-making as an annual function. Dinners are constantly being given in honor of some person or event, not to mention the countless private functions at which informal speaking plays an important part.

**Qualities of the Toast.**—The prevalent misconception that the after-dinner speech must be humorous is responsible for many failures. The essential quality of after-dinner oratory is felicity. It is a time of good cheer and good fellowship. For the time being, at least, all who sit at the table are friendly, and persons having antagonistic opinions should refrain from discussing them. Subjects to be avoided are scientific and philosophical themes which require concentrated attention, but this does not mean that the speaker must turn entirely from serious questions and attempt the rôle of humorist.

The speech should be agreeable, both in its matter and manner of presentation. To be agreeable, however, it is not necessary to be humorous; to lack humor is not necessarily to be dull. Woodrow Wilson's speech at the Jackson Day Dinner (*page 227*) is an excellent example of a felicitous after-dinner speech. It was widely discussed at the time.

**Choosing the Theme.**—A wide range of topics is open to the after-dinner speaker. He is under no compulsion to search for a theme upon which he believes all persons present will agree, or one which is so new that they will have no opinion on it. An audience always respects a speaker who frankly differs from them, who states both sides fairly, and candidly sets forth his own contentions. There is no better source of after-dinner topics than local or general issues of present interest.

**Preparation.**—The subject chosen, the speaker must give himself to careful preparation. Though he may be asked to make only "a few informal remarks," he should, nevertheless, be thoroughly ready. The informal remarks which are most appreciated are those which are formally prepared. The speaker who trusts to the inspiration of the moment for something to say is likely to disappoint both himself and his audience. No one is justified in taking the time of the audience unless he knows what he is to say and how he will say it. The hints given in an earlier chapter regarding the methods of preparing a speech are applicable to after-dinner

speaking. But whether the method be memoriter or extemporaneous, or a combination of both; the preparation should be thorough, the more especially if the extemporaneous method is chosen.

What Lowell said of writing, "the art consists in knowing what to leave in the inkpot," is equally true of speaking. The requirements of after-dinner speaking make especially important the art of knowing what to leave unsaid. The audience is not in a critical mood. It will applaud almost any sentiment, and gives the noisiest approval to that which is jolliest or most entertaining. After-dinner approval, however, is not always confirmed by the judgment of the next morning.

Many after-dinner speeches outlast the patience of the audience. Speeches of five to ten minutes should prevail. It is said that the secret of Senator Hoar's perennial popularity at the Harvard Phi Beta Kappa dinner was that his speeches contained one general idea clearly stated, and one fresh story well told.

**Stories.**—The after-dinner speech should contain more stories than other forms of speech, but the stories should be fresh and authentic. Nothing is more wearisome than the stale story, and to tell an old yarn as a personal experience is not only bad ethics, but is likely to repel rather than amuse the audience.

**Delivery.**—As previously noted, the after-dinner speaker must not only have agreeable matter, but

he must add an agreeable manner. The speaker is usually the guest of the company, and to his host he will be gracious. At the beginning he may say some words of cordial greeting, or counter the pleasantry of the toastmaster, always remembering that sincerity is the requisite in all true compliment, and that fulsome praise is worse than none at all. Such a beginning not only serves the amenities, but accords with the simple, direct manner of speaking which is one of the charms of after-dinner oratory. Whatever makes the speech seem informal adds much to its effectiveness.

If the Athenian orators dreaded to mispronounce a word for fear they would be hissed by the people, the American orators should eschew slovenliness. It is fitting that with the beautiful decorations, the sumptuous menu, and perfection of service which characterize our dinners, there should be felicity of speech. In after-dinner speaking, fittingness is effectiveness. Elegance of speech is always charming, but at a banquet it is particularly so.

**Entertainment as an End.**—There are certain general principles which are helpful in making speeches interesting, although entertainment may not be the chief desideratum. The importance of making every speech interesting so as to insure its appeal to the audience has been touched upon in a previous chapter. The speaker who feels that his speech may fail to interest will do well to ask himself the following questions: Is it vital? Does it contain

elements of surprise and suspense? Are the illustrations well chosen?

**Vitality.**—A speech will be vital if it appeals to those fundamental motives that underlie all human character: love of family, of home, of country; self-preservation; gain or ambition; or, if it treats of courage, ability, unselfishness, or any of the qualities which men like to fancy are exemplified in themselves. A direct personal style and specific rather than general language go far toward giving the spoken word that vitality which penetrates the hearer's mind with the force of a special message.

**Surprise and Suspense.**—The elements of surprise and suspense are the fundamentals of humor. It is the unexpected word or the unusual situation in infinite combination or variation that sets us off into peals of laughter. It is uncertainty of the outcome that holds us breathless through the well-written short story. Conflict wins attention. When the speaker turns to narration for purposes of illustration he should remember that suspense is the quality most essential to effectiveness, and if he is working for a humorous climax, that it must come as a surprise.

**Illustrations.**—Illustrations, whether humorous or merely illuminative, should receive careful attention, to the end that they may really illustrate. There is such a wealth of material at the command of an observant person that there is little excuse for the obvious "chestnuts" or anything offensive to good

taste. Half of the story is in the telling, a gift to which some are born. Everyone, however, should be able to tell a good story creditably. Many of the failures are due to lack of preparation, to the omission or misplacing of some important word, to lack of pause or emphasis, or poor judgment in selecting and arranging the points. Know your story, practice it until the pauses and inflections come as naturally as the words, and tell it directly to some person in the audience.

## CHAPTER VIII

### SPEAKING IN BUSINESS

**Its Uses.**—Elsewhere in this book is offered some testimony regarding the opportunities for efficient speakers in the business field, and the possibilities of leadership that are opened to the man who can influence his fellows. Both for employer and employee is the power of speaking effectively a business asset of great importance. Examine a few of the problems which occur regularly in the day's work, such as:

1. Settling disputes between employer and employees;
2. Getting better results or fairer treatment;
3. Hiring;
4. Selling goods or services;
5. Presenting reports or plans.

In every one of these instances the ability of the speaker to influence the other party and carry his point should result in direct monetary return in addition to the increased mental power which results from each demonstration of efficiency. Since practically all business relations are those of buying and selling or exchange, the problem becomes how

to influence men to give up something they possess in return for whatever you have to give them.

**Two Methods.**—Business men recognize and employ, sometimes separately but often in combination, two methods of influencing men. The first is Reason; the second is Suggestion. Salesmanship and Advertising rest alike on these two principles. Both have their adherents and constitute studies in themselves.

The method of Reason involves an appeal to the hearer's judgment by means of arguments designed to impress upon him the advantages which will accrue from accepting the speaker's proposition. The person to be influenced is encouraged to weigh and to compare, to balance, the various courses open to him, and the success of the plea depends upon the speaker's arguments being so convincing as to outweigh in the hearer's judgment the alternative propositions.

On the other hand, the method of Suggestion avoids rousing the judgment to action, and appeals directly to the will, from which it hopes to secure an immediate response.

Both methods have many advocates in the business world, but the use of one in no way precludes the use of the other, and a skilful blending of the two may frequently be used successfully when either would have failed alone.

Walter Dill Scott, in his book, "Influencing Men in Business," makes the following analysis of the comparative value of the two methods:

“Argument is to be preferred—

1. When exploiting any new thing;
2. When exploiting anything having unusual talking points (cheapness, novelty, economy, etc.);
3. When it is the exclusive form of persuasion;
4. In influencing professional buyers;
5. As an effective form of flattery.

“Suggestion is preferred—

1. When inadequate time is given for arguments;
2. In securing action following conviction;
3. As a supplementary method of convincing;
4. In dealing with the general public;
5. In securing immediate action.”

**Examples.**—One has only to turn to the columns of our periodicals to find abundant illustration of the two methods in advertising. “Use Pears’ Soap,” “Ivory Soap—It Floats,” and Gold Medal Flour’s “Eventually; why not now?” are familiar types of the suggestive method that have been enormously profitable. The Angelus, and Colgate’s toilet articles are usually advertised under the “reason why” method, as are usually motor cars exploiting exclusive devices. But while we find in advertising and salesmanship our most striking examples of these methods, they are none the less applicable to all other business problems where influencing men is the desideratum, and a few suggestions can be offered concerning their effective employment.

**Effective Arguments.**—The attitude of a business man toward a new proposition of any kind may be illustrated by six questions, upon which in some variation he must satisfy his mind before he will accept it.

1. What is it? What are its special merits? How does it differ from what I have already adopted?
2. Is it profitable? Will it yield a definite money return through saving of labor or material, increased output, advertising value, etc.?
3. Is it possible? Can I make practical use of it?
4. Will it gratify me personally? Will it add to my comfort, luxury, or advance my ambition?
5. Is there an alternative more desirable or cheaper?
6. Shall I decide favorably now, or wait a while and investigate further?

Upon the complete and authoritative answering of these queries the solicitor must base his hope of making the deal. He is appealing to the judgment of the other party, and must supply it with complete data for arriving at a decision. His arguments will therefore be so chosen as to furnish the most convincing evidence along these lines. Mere assertion will not suffice.

**Effective Suggestion.**—Dr. Scott, in the book already quoted, holds “that the working of suggestion is dependent upon the dynamic, impulsive nature of ideas”; that if a clear idea can be given a man it will

result in action unless the way is blocked by some stronger concept. The suggestion must be vivid and striking. It must give the effect of the poster in speech. It must be made with authority. The two kinds of authority to which men are the most susceptible are the say-so of friends and the consensus of public opinion. In making use of suggestion, the hearer must be approached in a friendly, genial spirit, not aggressively or patronizingly; and if the testimony of popular approval can be brought to bear it should be taken full advantage of. We constantly meet with the phrase in advertising: "Thousands of satisfied customers use Blank's —; why not you?" The same principle can be used in speech.

As previously stated, since suggestion appeals directly to the will, anything tending to invite comparison with alternatives and to involve the more protracted processes of reason should be excluded. It deals with effects, not causes. In selling food-stuffs by this method, the agent will endeavor to stir the pleasurable sensations of a pleased palate rather than dilate upon food values or economy. The distinctive feature of the suggestive method is that it deals with concrete pictures rather than reasons why.

**Study the Audience.**—In an earlier chapter has been emphasized the importance of untiring study in acquiring the art of reading human nature quickly. To no one is this more essential than to the man whose livelihood depends upon his ability

to influence men in business. Individuals and groups differ greatly in the degree to which they respond to reason and suggestion. If the speaker can read his audience, whether it be one or a hundred persons, he can judge which arguments are likely to prove most effective. Some men are extremely responsive to suggestion: others rarely act unless impelled by reason. These differences can be quickly turned to advantage by the man who is skilled in recognizing them.

The relation of psychology and efficient speaking to the successful conduct of business affairs is becoming generally recognized, and offers an interesting and profitable field for experimental work.

## PART II

---

### SPEECHES FOR STUDY

---

#### THE ETHICS OF CORPORATE MANAGEMENT

CHARLES W. ELIOT

Parts of an address by Charles W. Eliot, L.L. D., at the fifty-sixth regular meeting of the Merchants Club of Chicago, March 10, 1906.

That this Merchants Club should ask one whose occupations have been teaching science for fifteen years and educational administration for thirty-seven years to address the club on the ethics of corporation management is an interesting manifestation of the prodigious change which has come about in the course of four or five centuries—gradually until recent times, but rapidly during the last half century—in regard to the responsibility of different classes of men for the maintenance and diffusion of sound ethical standards. A thousand years ago the idea of sanctity and competency for ethical teaching involved seclusion from the world. The saint was an anchorite, a monk, or a nun. In fact, if we go back not more than a hundred years, the minister or priest was preëminently the teacher of ethics; so that it was the business of a profession

set apart from secular affairs to uphold in the world the standards not only of religion but of natural piety and public righteousness. How different is the situation to-day! You and I, and all the people in this country whom we may be said to represent or typify, are fully persuaded that the most effective teachers of ethics to-day are the righteous men who are active in all the secular affairs of the world—that is, in farming, manufacturing, mining, trade, the professions, and politics. These are the men who, being righteous, can best influence the people to piety, justice, and righteousness. These are the men who, being themselves unrighteous, may drag the people down towards depravity and sin. The recluse, and the religionist who separates religion from conduct, are losing their hold on civilized man; and the only ethics that command respect are the ethics that guide and control men in the intensest labors and struggles of the actual world.

It is no wonder that the ethics of corporation management are in some respects indeterminate, and therefore an urgent subject of public discussion; for the invention of the business corporation itself is hardly more than fifty years old, and this new creation deals with forms of property which are highly novel. Indeed, all the actual forms of property except real estate, mortgages, promissory notes, chattels, and coin, are novel. It is hard for our generation to keep in mind how very new are most of the actual forms of property and all the present

modes of doing business. All the implements and methods of modern industry, with corporation stocks and bonds, the universal cheque and cheque-stub, and card catalogues and ledgers beside, have been created within the memory of many men here present. Is it any wonder that the ethics of modern business are not yet firmly settled? The ethical conventions gradually agreed upon during centuries concerning transactions in the ancient forms of property have had to be extended and adapted to immense new forms of property and new processes of production and distribution. In making these extensions and adaptations, legislatures and courts are in arrears; they have not been able to keep up with the onward rush of eager and adventurous business, particularly in this country, where industrial and commercial enterprise is stimulated by a political and social freedom heretofore unknown.

• • • •

**I. Capitalization.**—There are usually two foundations for the capitalization of a business corporation. The first is the money actually paid for the property or plant; the second is the earning power of the plant and the organization. Both these foundations may be real and solid at any given moment, but both are liable to grave changes. Most plants deteriorate or waste, and constantly require partial replacement. Earning power may be unexpectedly either increased or diminished by natural causes, or by bad management or fraud. . . . . Most energetic corporations often need new capital. Im-

provements of the plant and means to meet new needs are often so urgently demanded that the question how to obtain them may fairly be called a question of life and death for the industry or corporation concerned. One of the open secrets of American efficiency in manufacturing is the courage and enterprise with which the American manufacturer will throw away his old machinery in favor of better. With every such rejection capital is sacrificed. The hard-earned savings, it may be, of many years are suddenly thrown away, and instead new capital must be sought. The principles underlying capitalization are therefore of continuous interest in most industries.

At any stage of any corporate business the questions of capitalization and over-capitalization may come up; and if new capital is sought at a period when industries are active and the public is sanguine, directors or managers will be tempted to over-capitalization. For a corporation doing a strictly private business, subject to competition, and possessing no privileges conferred by the public, over-capitalization in the form of over-issues of bonds and stock is largely a question of the most profitable use of the stock market in raising money, provided that the real earning power of the property can be got at by inquiring investors. Secrecy as regards earning power may give opportunities for deception and subsequent disaster; but, if the whole situation be above board, directors and investors may be safely left to their own devices and bargain-

ings, since no question of public morality is involved.

There are two aspects of over-capitalization which demand the attention of the public. In the first place, the several States of the Union have power to prevent the issue of stock not fully paid for if they see fit to exercise that power. As a fact, legislation on this subject is not uniform; and the States really compete with each other for the taxes which may be derived from corporations established within their respective borders. The looser States compete with the stricter by making their laws as little restrictive for the corporations as possible, and leaving the investing public to take care of itself. This demoralizing competition is, to say the least, an abandonment by some States of their true position as moral teachers. Secondly, over-capitalization is an evil because of its effect on the state of mind of wage-earners. Reasonable wage-earners are content to have ingenuity, skill, and knowledge in discovering resources, and organizing industries reap a considerable immediate reward in the case of new undertakings; because they realize that the laboring classes, in common with the entire community, reap advantages from all successful industrial undertakings. But they are never willing that established industries should issue either bonds or stock which are not fully paid for; because they believe that the wage-earners can in that way be compelled for all time to earn not only their own wages, but dividends on a stock, part of which rep-

resents neither money invested nor any contribution of human skill and labor. The alleged over-capitalization of a large proportion of American industries managed by corporations is one of the main causes of the existing industrial unrest. This inevitable state of feeling is a fact which is to be taken into account in dealing with the whole question of expedient and righteous capitalization; because it intensifies the conflict between capital and labor. . . . .

**II. Promotion.**—The methods used in what is called promotion give rise to a large part of the current criticism on corporation management. Far-sighted men, who know and apply intelligent methods of determining the value of new resources in mines, forests, transportation, and trade, and who have also high business credit and access to concentrations of movable capital, seeing a chance to combine several companies, or to build up a new company, or to undertake the development of some new natural resource, make a plan to carry out the new undertaking, and offer on the market bonds, preferred stock, and common stock—often in blocks which contain all three sorts of securities. The sum of the paper securities often largely exceeds the actual cost in money or goods of the real properties which underlie the undertaking. This excess represents the hoped-for reward for skill in the discovery of new resources, for the risks—sometimes light, but often heavy—which accompany the new undertaking, and for the credit which is the indispensable

ground of success in the market. If the advantages of the plan are obvious and the risks are consequently light, an ordinary commission on the transactions may be an adequate reward for the promotion; but if the adventure is obviously a risky one, it is just that a large reward should tempt promoters to take the risk. . . . . Two ethical principles ought, however, to govern all promoting schemes. In the first place, all representations concerning the immediate or future value of the bonds and stocks issued should be absolutely true as regards the facts stated, and moderate and reasonable as regards the prospects of future profit. Secondly, if years are going to be needed to develop the new enterprise, the promoters have no right to abandon the undertaking so soon as they have sold enough bonds and stock to give them an immediate return in commissions and rake-offs. . . . . The conscientious promoter will not quit the enterprise he has promoted until it is thoroughly on its feet, and all men can see its results and its unquestionable value. Large enterprises in manufacturing, mining, and transportation cost a great deal beside money. They call for imagination, courage, the power to forecast events, the capacity to select efficient agents, and credit in the money market. All these elements of service are entitled to their reward. The promoter, then, must in the first place tell the truth; and, secondly, he must stand by his undertaking until real and visible value has been put into all the securities he issues. As to the lying, cajoling

promotion, which aims at getting the money of inexperienced or foolish persons, it is merely one form of the criminal offence of obtaining money on false pretenses. It ought always to be prosecuted by its victims and punished by the courts. . . . .

**III. Directors.**—Although the state of the law as to how far directors are trustees or fiduciary agents is somewhat hazy, there is no doubt concerning several principles which should govern the conduct of directors and determine their selection. Thus, all the directors of a corporation are under obligations to give their personal attention and vigilant care to the business of the corporation. If damage result from their lack of care or inattention to duty, they are responsible for that damage. They are responsible not only for wrong-doing of their own, but also for inattention to the wrong-doing of others, and for failure to act when action was needed. Secondly, the directors of the corporation cannot shift their responsibility on to sub-committees or officers and agents appointed by themselves, or be in any way excused from exercising that diligent supervision which a prudent man exercises in the conduct of his own affairs. It follows from this principle that the directors in any business corporation ought to be men who understand the business of that corporation and have time to attend to it. Because directors should be experts in one business, corporations which do several kinds of business are generally to be distrusted. . . . . Dummy directors and figure-head directors, whose

names appear in from twenty to seventy boards, are not directors in any proper sense under the laws as they now stand. They do not give a reasonable amount of time to the service of the corporations in which they figure, and obviously they cannot exercise any real control over the affairs of the corporations they nominally direct. They have wrongfully assumed a trust they have no power to execute.

Every director ought to have a pecuniary investment in his corporation which might fairly be supposed to give him a considerable individual or personal interest in its success. He should not be qualified for his directorship solely by the transfer to him of the minimum amount of stock which the law requires a director to hold, but should have a real interest in the success of the corporation, although his serviceableness may not be proportionate to the amount of stock he holds. . . . .

Directors are so far trustees that they may not honorably sell the control of their corporation, either for their own account or for the account of a limited number of stockholders, without providing that each and every stockholder shall be allowed to participate in the benefits of the sale. The rights of all the stockholders should be guarded by their trustees, the directors, no matter how troublesome a small minority of stockholders may have made themselves. . . . .

**IV. Publicity.**—All laws which promote publicity as to the management of corporations, by enforcing the publication of clear accounts and intelligible

statements of the condition of the corporation, help toward the improvement of the ethics of corporation management. Three kinds of corporation, at least, should be forced to publish at brief intervals intelligible accounts which reveal the true state of the plant, the bulk of the business, the proportion of expenses to receipts, the salaries, and the gain or loss—though not all of them for quite the same reasons—investment and fiduciary concerns, like banks, trust companies, savings banks, and insurance companies; public franchise companies in general; and all great corporations which appeal frequently to the investing public. On the whole, there has been of late years a wise tendency to legislation which compels publication of the accounts of corporations in which the public obviously have an immediate and pressing concern; but there have been occasional examples of laws expressly intended to prevent public accounting, or to prevent directors being called to account for their acts by stockholders or the public. Thus, the 49th section of the general corporation law of New Jersey (1896) provides that, "Any corporation formed under this act may purchase mines, manufactories or other property necessary for its business, or the stock of any company or companies owning, mining, manufacturing or producing materials, or other property necessary for its business, and issue stock to the amount of the value thereof in payment therefor, and the stock so issued shall be full-paid stock and not liable to any further call, neither shall the holder

thereof be liable for any further payment under any of the provisions of this act; and in the absence of actual fraud in the transaction, the judgment of the directors as to the value of the property purchased shall be conclusive." This section enables any board of directors, so disposed, to water their stock simply by declaring that water or marsh is solid ground. They have only to declare that the stock issued against their purchases is full-paid. In general, secret management and secret acts in important corporations have a pernicious tendency; and particularly they tempt directors to malfeasance, and excite in the public mind suspicions, sometimes just and sometimes unjust, but always injurious. Legislation which prevents publicity is, of course, to be deprecated, in spite of its occasional convenience.

In order that publicity concerning the management of corporations should prove a remedy for old abuses and a protection against new ones, there must exist a strong public sentiment against the professional and business men who assist corporations in their efforts to defeat laws intended for the protection of the public, or to procure quietly modifications of existing laws in the interest of corporations and against the interest of the public. It is also important that a strong public sentiment should be cultivated in support of public officials who refuse to wink at the evasion by corporations of statutes designed to promote the public good. The foundation of the belief that publicity will promote

justice and honor in corporation management is the conviction in the minds of directors, public officials, the business community, and the press, that, on the whole, the mass of the people will come out on the side of righteousness. Publicity cannot prove a remedy for abuses, old or new, unless the public, before which the facts are to be brought, is a moral public. The public opinion which will reform abuses and suppress evils must itself be an honest and strenuous public opinion.

**V. Salaries.**—A great abuse has of late years grown up in corporations which do a large business, or hold and use great properties—namely, the exaggeration of salaries and perquisites. In the first place, the acceptance of several salaries from different companies or corporations is always to be distrusted, inasmuch as the underlying supposition ought to be that a man owes all his time and strength to the company which pays him an adequate salary, and that his interest should not be divided between different corporations or different services. In the next place, multiple salaries are injurious because they overpay the recipient. The huge single salaries of recent times also overpay their recipients. The excuse for them has been that in conducting a large business the right man is cheap at any price, and the wrong man dear at any price. The fallacy of this argument is that the exaggerated salary will not really get or keep the best man—indeed, is not needed in order to get or keep him. . . . .

The first duty of a corporation towards its employees is to provide those external conditions which will promote health, cheerfulness, and vigor in the working people. The efficiency of any large body of workmen is greatly promoted by healthy and cheerful surroundings. What is nowadays called welfare work is not a benevolence or a charity; it is simple economy, common sense, and common humanity. It requires some small expenditure on the part of a corporation; but primarily it requires considerateness and an intelligent comprehension of human nature. This consideration it is the clear duty of every corporation to give.

Secondly, every corporation should endeavor to secure for its workmen freedom for the play of individual powers, and should keep before every competent workman the hope and expectation of improving his lot as time goes on. This means that the workman should be free to work zealously; and it also means a scale of wages which rises with the age of the workman up to middle life.

In the next place, every corporation should try its best to procure for all its employees steady employment, thereby promoting satisfactory conditions for family life, and securing a resident laboring population instead of a nomad population. A nomad population will not be a civilized population—except, indeed, that youth may safely be permitted a few years of wandering.

Again, every corporation should study the means of prolonging the earning of wages beyond the

period of greatest efficiency. Provision for men who have passed their prime, but are still capable of the less active forms of service, all corporations will make that have quick consciences in regard to their duties to employees, or intelligent comprehension of their own interests. Early superannuation is a very depressing condition in any calling.

Further, a corporation whose business requires the handling of its money by numerous agents should provide all possible checks and guards against dishonesty on the part of such employees. A corporation that neglects such precautions will train thieves, instead of honest men. That the precautions may cost more than the thefts they would prevent is no excuse for not providing them.

No corporation has a right to encourage or connive at any monopoly of the kind of labor it buys; because the corporation which yields to such a monopoly abridges the just liberty of working men, and liberty is an indispensable condition of public and private happiness. It is another phase of the same principle, that no corporation should seek, by force or indirection, to establish a monopoly of its own.

Justice and promptness in dealing with complaints is another clear duty of corporations toward their employees; and so is generosity in rewarding valuable suggestions made by employees concerning the conduct of the business. The competent discharge of these duties will go far to promote good will between the employer and the employed;

and a steady good will in work is the great promoter of efficiency in production, and of satisfaction in daily work.

The responsibility of corporations for the ethical training of their employees grows heavier and heavier in this country as corporations become larger and an increasing proportion of the working people of the country is found in the service of corporations. In a nation which puts every young man into its army or navy for two or three years, the army and navy can be used as schools of obedience, neatness, politeness, fidelity, and loyalty. They are so used in some measure by European nations, though not adequately. In the United States the industrial army must perform this function, instead of a standing army and a navy; and the armies of industry are, on the whole, much better fitted for this function than the public forces trained for the savagery of war. Well-managed corporations can provide admirable discipline in courtesy, neatness, punctual coöperation and loyalty, if only they systematically use judicious means for giving this ethical training. To organize these means and use them habitually require forethought, wisdom, firmness, and good temper in corporate management; and these qualities in the managers should be sought for and paid for. No corporate expenditure could possibly be more productive, from the business point of view, or more profitable towards the improvement of the national character. This is one of the directions in which corporate management

should be ethical; and no management is truly ethical that does not make the employees better and finer men and women.

Not long ago, at a public dinner of the National Civic Federation, at which much had been said about the importance of industrial peace, I ventured to say, near the close of the meeting, that our business community certainly wanted peace between capital and labor, but that it should be peace with liberty. I remain of that opinion, believing that liberty with troubled peace is better for both capital and labor than untroubled peace without liberty. How can both peace and liberty be attained? There is only one way—through righteousness in the dealings of man with man. Truces and armed neutralities may be brought about by mutual fear, or by the exhaustion of the combatants; but durable peace comes only by justice or righteousness. When one has been exploring long-time evils, and has been trying to get down to the solid foundations of human happiness, one is sure to find that some old Hebrew writer has put the elemental philosophy of the whole subject into a memorable phrase. The ethics of corporation management will, indeed, have been brought to a happy issue when, as the Psalmist puts it, "Righteousness and peace have kissed each other."

## THE PRINCIPLES OF BUSINESS SUCCESS

HUGH CHALMERS

Extracts from an address by Hugh Chalmers, president of the Chalmers Motor Car Co., before a company of business men in Detroit, Mich.

The business man deals with five M's—money, materials, machinery, men, and merchandise. It is not so hard to get money, materials, and machinery. Each of these is a given quantity and with each and all of them a given result can be accomplished.

The big thing is to get men.

In the primitive days of manufacturing the great question was one of production. The market was ready, and we strived constantly for greater perfection. Nowadays the great question is one of distribution, the getting of things from where they are to where they ought to be.

The two great factors in distribution are salesmanship and advertising. The relationship between the two, in my opinion, is the closest relationship it is possible to have. It is closer than the team under a single yoke; it is closer than friends; it is closer than brothers; yes, it is closer than the relation between man and wife, because there can never be a separation or divorce.

Advertising is salesmanship, and salesmanship is advertising. Every ad. is a salesman, and every salesman is an ad. There is this difference: Advertising is salesmanship plus publicity; salesmanship is advertising plus getting the order signed. Advertising creates the atmosphere of business, and the salesman follows and takes the orders.

It is hard to analyze the successful salesman, but, after all, the analysis gets down really to the question of personality.

There are certain qualities I have been asked to give here to-night which I believe we should have in business to be successful. We are all salesmen; every man is trying to sell his own good qualities to his fellow-citizens. That is why he puts on a clean collar and a clean shirt and everything that goes with it, because he wants to sell his good qualities.

The first essential is to be healthy, to have health. Most of us are paid for having good livers, but unfortunately some have bad ones. There is nothing helps a man so much as to take care of himself. Most of us have injurious habits; we smoke too much, we eat too much, or we drink too much; we are handicapped in that way. I know men with good minds, but their bodies are not healthy, and I would rather take my chances with a healthy mind in a healthy body.

The next quality is honesty. I do not refer to it in the baser sense, because a man is a fool nowadays unless he is absolutely honest. There is an

old maxim, "Honesty is the best policy." There is nothing "best" about it; honesty is the only policy. Most men I have met have two arms, two legs, two eyes, two ears, a nose, and a mouth, and, considering their height, they weigh about the same. What is the difference in men? Power, ability: Some people may have that developed more than others, but I say nine-tenths, yes, ninety-nine-hundredths could develop ability.

I find just three kinds of men in this world: The kind you tell once to do a thing, and you can bet your life it is done. The second class you have to tell four or five or a dozen times to do it because they do not think. The third class is the great class of men who have made this country what it is—men with initiative; men who do things, who do things before you have a chance to tell them what to do. We must do things quickly; we must have initiative, and that is the greatest quality a man can possess. I would rather have a man in my employ who could do six out of ten things right than a fellow who did four things right and never did anything else. There is nothing wrong in making a mistake; the only wrong is in making the same one twice.

Next to that I think a man ought to have a thorough knowledge of his business. I was at a convention in Berlin, Germany, of two hundred salesmen. They did not understand anything I said and I did not understand anything they said, and we got along all right. There was a man there who had

carried off the banner of four successive years, and as we were distributing the prizes I said to him: "Mr. Hoffman, will you tell the men why you have been leader for four years in succession?" He could not have given a better answer than he gave. He said: "Gentlemen, I defy anybody in Germany to ask a question about my business I cannot answer." That was the secret of his success; he knew his business.

Another quality we need is tact. Tact! What is tact? That ability—although it is rare—that enables one man to deal with other men of different temperaments in the right way and get along with all of them. Some people mistake tact for "jolly." Tact is not so much what a man says, but how he says it. You men who are writing letters to traveling men and other people—those hot words you dictate become cold type when received. A man gets exactly what you say and reads it that way. Let us be careful about the letters we write; let us develop this quality of tact.

The next thing we ought to have is industry; the man you always find on the job, who does a good day's work—but it is unnecessary to talk to western men about work, because it is the western man who occupies the highest positions in New York, Boston, and other eastern centers, for if you will investigate you will find western men in seven-tenths of those positions, because they were taught to work in the west, and they carried that quality with them to the east.

Now, then, sincerity is a quality we ought to possess. Next to being honest and able, we ought to be sincere men. Sincerity is that quality which not only makes friends, but holds them. A man cannot be insincere without injury to himself. Whether you are talking to one man or a thousand, whether you are talking to me or to a customer, you are throwing thoughts to his brain; you cannot see them, but they are tangible, and you cannot throw insincere thoughts to the brain and not have the brain catch insincere thoughts. No more than I could throw this glass to you and you catch a pitcher. It is not changed or transformed; it comes to you in the way it leaves me. So I say we must perfect this quality of sincerity if we are to attain success. You know men in whom you absolutely believe because they are sincere. You say you like a man you can believe in because he can sell the goods. Insincerity has taken some orders, but it has never held a job.

We should be willing to ask for and receive suggestions. The man who knows it all is like the fellow standing on the street with the fool-killer waiting just around the corner. None of us know it all. We might be up to date at 6 o'clock, but unless we are up to date right now we don't know it all. I have made it a rule to be willing to accept suggestions, and I would as soon be stopped in the hall by the janitor as by the general manager, because the chances are ten to one that the janitor

knows more about the business he wants to talk about than the general manager.

In addition to all of these things mentioned, a man must have enthusiasm. Unless he has enthusiasm he is a mere statue. Because enthusiasm is the white heat that fuses all of these qualities into one effective mass. I would not give a cent for a man without enthusiasm. If a man has no enthusiasm he is no good. If you ever get enough money so you could do so you don't want to retire. Men who retire from business do not live as long as those who do not. What we want to do is to have our business in such shape that we can get some pleasure and play out of it as well as work. Let us enjoy our work, and let us alternate business and pleasure. We must keep up enthusiasm if we want to keep out of a rut. The only difference between a rut and a grave is in the width and the depth. We graduate from one to the other.

## THE UNKNOWN QUANTITIES

M. T. FRISBIE

Excerpts from an address delivered before the Poor Richard Club of Philadelphia, April 7, 1910, by M. T. Frisbie, advertising manager L. C. Smith & Bros. Typewriter Co., of Syracuse, N. Y.

A story is told of how Sir Walter Besant once accepted an invitation to speak at a meeting in London upon "The Secret of Success in Fiction Writing." Among the platform committee was James Payn, the canny Scotch story writer and critic.

Just as Sir Walter rose to his feet, prepared to initiate his audience into all the mysteries of his profession, he felt a tug at his coat tails. Looking around, he beheld Payn, pale but determined.

"What is it, Jimmy?" he asked.

"For God's sake, Walter, you're not going to tell them how we do it?"

Now, don't any of you go pulling at my coat tails, for I'm not presumptuous enough to think I can unfold to you the hidden secret of success in advertising. . . . .

The Unknown Quantities in advertising, about which I shall speak, would, if advertising were an exact science, soon be resolved—through equation,

proportion, and elimination—into tangible, estimable factors.

But advertising being, as yet, not a science—only an art—we are obliged to cut and try, to feel our way, to follow our intuitions, and then thank our lucky stars, if, after spending the last dollar of our hard-wrung appropriation, we find ourselves within a thousand miles of the goal.

Some day, when the psychologists and the blacksmiths, the fifty-thousand dollar copy-men, and the circulation-affidavit makers have all completed their perfect work, there may be a “Science and Art of Advertising” that can be mastered by the student in college, or by the hard-working mechanic who takes his dose of correspondence school, after he has washed up, at home, evenings.

But don’t worry, for what happens then will not interest us.

One of the most important of these unknown quantities, because it is vital to many of us advertisers, is the value of our general publicity.

Now, in its application to a particular business, can its actual worth be determined? Ability to estimate this value accurately would be of untold importance. Must it always go unmeasured—unreckoned? . . . . .

Within the past few months national advertisers have been asked by magazine publishers for data relative to the number of replies, under first-class postage, received from advertisements in given

issues of their publications. Many were unable to make a definite statement.

What is the value of your publicity advertising in any given newspaper or magazine? Can you answer?

Yet, without some means of judging this value, satisfactory at least to us, what warrant have you and I to continue spending our firms' money for such publicity?

We cannot even fall back on the theory that all advertising, like whiskey, is good advertising, but some is better, for we are painfully aware that not all advertising is good, and some is worse.

Still we go on burning the midnight oil to produce our general publicity copy and blindly trust, as Tennyson puts it:

"That, somehow, good  
Will be the final goal of ill."

And in the faith that this confidence is not entirely misplaced, we find great comfort and consolation.

A case in point.

When the Smith Brothers withdrew from the Union Typewriter Company, built a factory and produced a new high-grade writing machine in record time—a record, by the way, that yet stands—it became the duty of your speaker to break the news to the public.

Now it is not to be supposed the dear public was lying awake o' nights in its anxiety to hear that a promising youngster had been added to the typewriter family. But this is what happened:

A full page display, rather clumsily put together (in fact, it got more than a page roast on the griddle of *Judicious Advertising*), appeared in three monthly magazines, of national importance, with corresponding space in two national weeklies, simply announcing the fact that L. C. Smith & Bros. were now making typewriters, but couldn't, as yet, fill orders at all rapidly.

And this item of general publicity was productive of replies at a cost of less than seventy-five cents apiece—a result that has not since been duplicated, and probably never will be duplicated in the history of the business.

This phenomenally low inquiry-cost was probably partially due to an information campaign, which, by means of an extensive mailing-list, had been conducted for several months prior to the final announcement. The campaign consisted of a series of news articles in Syracuse papers, often illustrated by cuts showing the progress of work, and designed to keep up public interest.

But these by themselves had not served to bring the replies in such a flood. It was the publicity announcement that turned the trick. . . . .

Having settled the matter of mediums to the best of our ability, there is one thing we can do to increase the value of our General Publicity Advertising, and that is to make it alive, instructive—vitaly instinct with the merits of our goods.

“Pears Soap.” That was the original form of pure publicity—just “Pears Soap” in big type and a

loud voice. "Have You Used Pears Soap?" came next. That was better. But after a hundred years of this conservative form of advertising we begin occasionally to see "Use Pears Soap, because—" and that is the best of all.

For there is no good argument why pure publicity copy should not also be reason-why copy—in fact, the argument is all the other way, provided the reason is so briefly set forth that he who runs may read, and so pertinently that the quality or peculiarity which constitutes the reason may be identified in the mind's eye with the product itself. "It floats" and "99% pure," from the Proctor & Gamble copy, are examples. . . . .

Another Unknown Quantity, with which we purchasers of advertising space have almost daily to deal, lies hidden in the claims which publishers make or decline to make regarding circulation.

Those of you who buy space are familiar with the two kinds of solicitors. One, who says, in a confidential whisper:

"You know what these big circulation claims amount to—figured before the newsdealers' 'returns' are in. But 'Canned Brains' isn't a news stand publication. It has a gilt-edged subscription list and goes paid-in-advance direct to the homes of just the kind of people who can afford to buy your \_\_\_\_." Well, I see you have heard the rest of it.

Then in comes the next solicitor with a swagger and a copy of the "Big Noise" under his arm.

"How does that strike you?" he asks, in a voice

that carries to the next block, "Red last month, blue this, purple next. See it on the stand a block away. More full pages of advertising than any other one of the Big Six. Circulation gaining at the rate of a thousand a day."

You are properly impressed, but venture to inquire what the circulation is.

"Look at our rate. A dollar a page per thousand copies actually printed and distributed—figure it yourself."

Now, as this rate has consistently held at, let us say \$500.00, year in and year out, in times of plenty and through the lean years as well, and as that seems to be the only consistent thing about it (no, I am naming no names, and I don't mean the magazine you think, anyway), you are inclined to wonder, as between your whispering friend and your noisy one, which, if either, is entitled to full credence.

· · · · ·

Personally I am much inclined to be nearly as gun-shy of both these classes of solicitors as I am of one who says:

"We won't open our books to every Tom, Dick, and Harry, who use only an inch or so of our space each month, but if you want any specific information, our entire office is at your disposal."

Of course that sounds well, and is flattering to a degree. But suppose you were in the small advertiser's place. Wouldn't you, too, want to know what you were buying with your money?

What is the answer?

It is for advertisers to find out.

Does it lie in making all contracts with a rebate clause? We got back a nice bunch of dollars from Collier's last year because their circulation didn't quite average up to the figure on which their advertising rate was based. I don't know just how much that policy cost Collier's, but when their solicitor comes in he gets one of the cigars that I keep in the far pigeon-hole.

Be not misled by circulation claims, but put your trust in the vigorous character of the publication that has a policy and stands for something—not your policy, perhaps—but, nevertheless, an earnest appeal to a living constituency.

And right along with this circulation problem comes the allied problem of duplication. . . . .

I have some doubt as to the advantage of duplication, particularly when uniform copy is used.

Of course its supporters will quote the proverb, "A continual dropping wears away the stone," but I can reply with the assertion by another author—the foremost advertiser of his age and time—"A continual dropping of a very rainy day and a contentious woman are alike." And who will say that Solomon was not well qualified to make the comparison? . . . . .

This subject is one that will bear looking into by the advertiser who is obliged to make his appropriation last as long and go as far as possible.

Mahin's carefully computed tables give the total number of families in the United States with an

income of more than \$900.00 a year as less than six and a quarter millions.

With incomes of \$1,200.00 a year and over, less than four and a quarter million families.

With incomes of \$3,000.00 and over, only 976,000 families.

Now, taking an expensive automobile proposition, for instance, the possible appeal must be positively limited to less than one million families with only a small percentage of that number as probable purchasers.

With million and half-million claimed circulations, numerous as they are to-day, what must be the waste in bird-shot of the automobile advertiser who uses, let us say, one of the big weeklies with its million more or less, four leading monthlies (over a million), and enough of the smaller ones to aggregate at least a million more?

Yet the automobile manufacturer prospers—and so for a time under similar prodigality did the bicycle manufacturer back in the nineties. . . . .

The figures of the last census show in round numbers seventeen and one-half million families in the United States. A circulation of one million means one family in every seventeen. Subtract the day-laborer, the negro, the foreign-speaking, and the illiterate classes, and a million circulation means reaching about one family in ten. . . . .

But with the magazine reading public limited to about ten million families and the combined circulation of the standard and unstandard magazines

amounting to—whatever it may—tell me, if you can, how the advertiser who uses “all the big ones” is going to avoid a very serious problem in duplication.

I will give you the benefit of one of our own experiences. Like many another valuable idea, we stumbled upon it while in search of something else.

We were using vertical half-pages, on twelve-time order, and getting outside lefthand position (when we could), but felt we were not making as much of a splash as we wanted to. All this occurred at a time when there was little chance for an increased appropriation. I asked in my good friend, Harry Porter, of the Frank Presbrey Company, for a conference, and we determined to use three-fourths-page space, which would give us more room for display, and run the copy fewer times, but alternatively, in the various publications, so that we should still have a certain amount of representation each month.

In “staggering” our list, we endeavored to arrange a schedule for the alternate appearances of our copy with the least possible disadvantage. For instance, Everybody’s and *Cosmopolitan* were offset; *McClure’s* and *American*; *Collier’s* and *Saturday Evening Post*, and so on down the line.

Thus we turned to our advantage the inevitable duplication of mediums of a certain class, slightly enlarged our list, obtained greater space for display, and, though this may sound paradoxical, were given reason to believe, both from inquiries re-

ceived and general business done (our only means of judging), that we had not failed to reach as many interested readers as under the old plan when our advertisement appeared every month in each publication.

I know this sort of talk will be considered treason by the publishers, but the facts are as I have stated. It has been suggested to me that this course might not be advisable for a concern just beginning to advertise. That is possibly true, but in our case the result seems to have been more extensive publicity and more effective publicity at no greater cost. . . . .

The agency representative assures us that "the big ones are the best pullers," and if our line was one that appealed, like an article of diet, to all humanity, we could not controvert his statement. But when we ask him, "Shall we, then, select one medium of mammoth circulation and expend our entire appropriation in a series of two-page spreads therein?" he hesitates.

Why?

Because he knows and realizes also that we know the utter uselessness of attempting to interest in typewriters in any way more than a quarter of the readers of the big popular mediums, and that consequently three-quarters of our appropriation would, in such a case, be spent in purchasing at the highest rate publicity of a character which could benefit us only by the most remote possibility.

What can we as advertisers do, then? We are

obliged to hedge, make additions to the list of a bunch of purely class mediums, every one of whose readers may be a possible purchaser.

From which do we get the greater returns in proportion to the money spent? . . . . .

It is possible that advertisers will be forced to seek, and may perhaps find, their remedy in the use of a judiciously selected list of class periodicals of lesser circulation but more certain appeal to probable users of their particular lines.

In what has been said I have endeavored merely to state some of the difficult problems that confront us as advertising men. I will not presume to offer a solution. But they are problems that each of us must wrestle with in his own way and, out of his own hard experience, establish a working hypothesis that will suffice until advertising, as a science, has made further progress.



## COMPARATIVE ADVERTISING METHODS— EAST AND WEST

HUGH A. O'DONNELL

Excerpts from an address by Mr. Hugh A. O'Donnell, business manager "The Philadelphia Press," delivered at the Poor Richard Club House, Philadelphia, Thursday, March 3, 1910.

Whatever I have to say regarding the comparative newspaper advertising values of the East and West must naturally be the result of first impression, and I run the risk of being seriously inaccurate. However, your city and people and newspapers have proven exceedingly interesting to me and the outsider's point of view may appeal to you as clarifying if not informative. At any rate, it is sincere. . . . .

Advertising is both an art and a science, and it is the art part that makes it an undefined science. There is just as much personal element in advertising as there is in salesmanship. Indeed, advertising in the usual sense is nothing more than salesmanship on paper addressed to a composite customer. It is an individual proposition in its principles, and that is why experience is its only teacher, unless it happens to be an intuition like any other talent. Nine-tenths of all talk on advertising is

futile because it is necessarily so general it is not applicable to more than one advertiser. We all grant publicity is the key to commercial success, but there are as many keys as there are successes, and there is no passkey of publicity to it. Each merchant must make his own, and he must keep ever trying and making and changing until he has made one that fits best his door to success. He alone can tell when he has done it, though he can't be always certain as to just how he did it. It's the trying that hurts and costs and teaches.

Contrary to the usual analysis, there is undoubtedly more money wasted in advertising than in any other investment, since it is the first and chief item of expense in nearly all business promotions. Under modern development there is expended on advertising over \$800,000,000 annually. It has made the luxuries of yesterday the necessities of to-day. Operating on well-established psychological laws, it has become the great positive, creative force in business. It makes men want things never before deemed necessary to their happiness or contentment. And so it is, advertising that pays must attract attention, then convince, then persuade, and it is just that system of creating desire that has made two blades of grass grow in the business world where only one grew before. There is no good in unknown good. The man who knows most can accomplish most. Advertising knowledge is mostly a knowledge of people. All mediums of publicity are merely the channels through which advertising

flows. The message delivered is the real advertising. And it must be applied to be other than theory. "You can learn to make chemical analysis from books and experiments; you can measure the distance to Jupiter and weigh the water in the ocean by mathematics; but there is something about folks which is beyond figures." It is the reaching out of the human to the human. Sometimes it's the little things that count. Colgate says his talcum powder is so good it can't be improved. He, therefore, advertises the improved box. A railroad advertises that its passenger trains start and stop without jar or jolt. All things equal, a small point will turn trade. To tell these little things cost big money, but it is worth it. . . . .

It is the same kind of word of mouth advertising backed by the usual printed statements that is the acme of great publicity. One pleased customer will tell ten and thus sales are perpetuated, business built and trade-marks made worth millions. And yet there is nothing cheaper than good advertising. Take, for instance, the circulation of a Philadelphia paper. There are probably 50,000 out of 165,000 readers who can spend an average of \$200 a year in each of twenty-five stores in town. That means a quarter of a billion dollars, and yet for \$10 you can buy fifty lines of space in that paper. That means casting bread on the water and having it come back buttered. You can chuck into fifty lines a message of probably 200 words to 165,000 possible buyers. That is a good many patrons to address, and in

200 words, well chosen, much can be said to the point. The whole story of the creation was told in less than four times that many.

It is difficult to compare Chicago and Philadelphia in regard to newspapers. Conditions are so different. . . . .

There is nothing free in Chicago. The largest user of display space pays just as promptly for the smallest classified ad. as you do for the collar you buy from the clothier after you have purchased a suit of clothes from him. No one ever asks the newspaper for a free reading notice out there. The newspapers used to write-up State Street stores at Christmas time, photographing the windows, etc., but the merchants themselves asked to have it stopped. While they admitted Marshall Field was the leading mercantile house of the city, there was always a disagreement as to who was second. If Mandels was named second, the others were displeased; and if Carson, Pirie, Scott was mentioned second in order, Mandels felt slighted; and if any cheap store was mentioned on the same page with Charles A. Stevens & Bros. that exclusive house became incensed. They all could be best pleased by pleasing no single one. And that is good judgment. The reporter sent out to review the store openings in the spring will use the same adjective superlative for the cheapest as well as the most exclusive store, and as these articles are run side by side it becomes ludicrous from the merchant's standpoint, a prostitutes' pander on the news-

paper's part and an insult to the reader. Besides, on the basis that business is business, why, for instance, should a merchant think he should have free at times what sells for, say \$1.00 a line, simply because he buys space at 20 cents a line? The woman who buys a half-dollar's worth of cheap candy doesn't expect a \$2.00 box of bon-bons thrown in because of the 50-cent cash purchase. And the merchant who pays a higher rate than the minimum because he doesn't buy enough space to earn the lower rate surely has less right. I think the day will come when an honest newspaper will refuse to sell its news columns at any price on the same basis as it protects its editorial integrity to-day.

And then as to position. There is a sort of fight for the back page of the papers in Chicago, but that is given on the basis of the quantity of space bought any one day. It is a contest among the merchants themselves, and one of them will use ten to twelve columns in order to be sure of having seven of them go on the back page. But no favor is asked of the newspaper. Indeed, it is not easy to buy position, as the newspaper justly argues that one position is good as another in a fair medium, and it does not wish to be hampered because of a few dollars in the proper making of the schedule. A newspaper's first duty is to its subscribers, and nothing should be done even in the unbalanced arrangement of a paper that might offend their sense of beauty. That the back page is valuable in an evening paper on the supposition that it is mostly read on street cars

will not bear analysis and certainly does not warrant the effort made to get it by the advertiser. This is doubly true of morning papers, which go directly into the homes.

As for the Chicago Daily News, its independence is so extreme, despite the fact it charges extra for position, electros and illustrations—it closes its classified columns almost twenty-four hours before publication, and as for display advertisements, first come, first served, and nothing guaranteed. I know a State Street store that argued for three hours one night trying to get the Daily News to guarantee its full page ad. would appear in the next evening's edition. The rules governing such promises were so rigid nothing could be done until Mr. Lawson, the owner, was reached at a club late in the night. The Daily News rate is the highest in Chicago, but its circulation reads its advertisements and the returns therefrom make it the cheapest investment for the merchant.

All concessions there in regard to free readers, position, etc., are considered equivalent to a cut of rate, and the newspaper which doesn't rigidly adhere to its rate card has a severe case of heart trouble that may prove fatal any time. The rate card is the bible of the newspaper business, and when you deviate from it you are getting away from revealed religion. Every advertiser should be privileged to the same rate as any other advertiser on the same conditions.

Good will is the real asset of any first-class paper,

and no newspaper is justified in doing anything to discount its integrity. The success of a paper is built on the confidence of its readers, and respectable and conscientious publishers endeavor to accept only such advertising as they can indorse to the subscriber. It is doubtful if the following of such ideals is appreciated. A clergyman in Minneapolis switched his advertising to a competing newspaper because he didn't consider enough editorial notice had been given his lectures by the newspaper which had thrown out \$25,000 worth of objectionable advertising. Virtue is not always rewarded.

In one year the Chicago Tribune refused \$80,000 worth of questionable advertising. At another time, for eighteen months, the same paper refused \$40,000 worth of advertising from a merchant who insisted on preferred position at the expense of his competitors—although his business was running in the other Chicago papers during that time.

You know circulation value really means quantity and quality added together and divided by two. The answer is the average, and the higher it is the more productive the circulation. Chicago emphasizes quality—not in the "class" sense, but circulation, which reaches the best people of all classes, whether those engaged in trades or in finance. Ten men with only a dollar a piece can only buy the bare necessities of life, but a single man with a ten-dollar bill has more purchasing power than the ten men in the aggregate because

he is in the position to buy the comforts of life which make profitable merchandise. The Chicago Tribune refuses to state its circulation, declaring space is sold on a basis of the selling power of a newspaper. It is unsound and unwise, they claim, to buy space on "so much per thousand of circulation," because the circulation of one newspaper may include the wastrels and derelicts of society and that of another paper may be among the earnest, honest, saving people in every walk of life. Personally, I think the argument is settled when the quality of circulation is well established and the quantity is published at the top of the editorial page every day. In the constantly reiterated statement of the amount of circulation and nothing else made by newspapers deficient in selling power is found the only plausible reason for inducing advertisers to spend "money in large sums for space in thin sheets." After all, in the final analysis, a newspaper has only one kind of merchandise to sell, and that is news—general news—the history of the day—and merchandise news or advertising. The newspaper having the most real news of the right sort will attract the most readers of discrimination and quality and, therefore, the reader is the only one who counts. A newspaper which becomes a misnomer and tries to feed the advertiser by free publicity instead of being the advertiser's feeder, reminds me of the old negro down South who was taken sick. A nurse put a fever thermometer under his tongue. The doctor called later and said:

"Howdy, Mose. How are you feeling?" "Ah'm feelin' a sight better, sah," said the negro. "Have you had any nourishment," said the physician? "Yes, sah," said the darkey, "a lady came in heah an' give me a piece of glass to suck." It is a sort of a "compliments of the season" proposition as delivered by Pat. "Sure," said Patrick, rubbing his hands with delight at the prospects of a Christmas box, "I always mane to do me duty." "I believe you," replied his employer, "and therefore I shall make you a present of all you have stolen from me during the year." "Thank ye', yur honor," replied Pat, "and may all your friends and acquaintances trate you as liberally."

While Philadelphia merchants may seem least disposed to promptly act on business facts compared with the Westerner and appear to lean towards sentiment, tradition and impression, yet there is seemingly more intimacy between them and the newspapers than anywhere on earth. The papers here give the merchant more coöperation in free publicity, cuts, drawings, etc., than can be gotten elsewhere, and the merchants seem to generously reciprocate.

Philadelphia was the first city in America to have and develop great newspapers. Practically every first-class newspaper in the United States buys its Sunday Woman's and Color Sections from the Philadelphia papers. There is scarcely an advertising writer in the land who is not keen to study and learn from the newspaper advertisements of

John Wanamaker, Strawbridge & Clothier and Gimbel Brothers. Philadelphia has more newspapers of a higher average of excellence than any city East or West. This city sets the standard of newspaper values everywhere for what is best in the business of journalism. It is the hub of the universe in the newspaper line. There are better advertising writers and more big users of newspaper space in Philadelphia through the great department stores than anywhere in America, and that means the world. There is not one Chicago merchant who runs a page every week day in the year in any newspaper there. New York is scarcely any better off. But here there are three or four merchants running a daily page in as many different newspapers. It is without a parallel.

I grant there is no place on earth where display rates are as low, considering results, as in Philadelphia. And fifteen cents a line is cheap classified space. But competition is closer here than elsewhere, and the papers themselves are of almost equal merit. But no city in America, population considered, compares with Philadelphia in the number and capacity of its enterprising stores. Those stores have made possible great newspapers, and the newspapers in return have created and developed those immense commercial institutions. And Philadelphia, the city of readers, thinkers and doers, has become celebrated for the energy of its merchants and the enterprise of its newspapers and just loyalty—makes it sacrilegious to take the name of any other city in vain for comparison.

## VANADIUM STEELS

LOUIS BRADFORD

A speech by an engineering student in the class of extemporaneous speaking at Swarthmore College.

If a piece of steel is repeatedly loaded to a point somewhere near the elastic limit, it is found that failure eventually occurs. The load causing rupture under these conditions is found to be much less than that which the steel could support if it had been applied only once. It is, indeed, usually less than the load required to give the specimen a permanent set. This phenomenon is known to engineers as the "Fatigue of Metals," and is one of the most difficult problems the designer has to face. The effect of fatigue is very noticeable in automobile races. Machines frequently have to withdraw from the race owing to the crank-shaft, axle, or other essential member having broken.

All these parts are designed with liberal factors of safety and with ordinary usage would have lasted indefinitely. The repeated application of the sudden stress incidental to racing, however, causes failure, although these stresses are within the elastic limit of the material. The effect of these failures on the design of machines is that dimensions of parts subject to repeated loading, whether shock or other-

wise, have become excessive and greatly increase the cost and weight of the machine.

Fatigue of metals is caused by the fact that a metal is not homogeneous. Steel, for instance, is composed of crystals, some comparatively weak, others comparatively strong. When a load comes upon a section the weakest crystals fail partially along its cleavage planes. Complete failure does not occur. If the load is repeated, the parts of the weakened crystal move still more, along its cleavage planes. If loading is continued, the crystal finally fails completely, and the stress it formerly carried is thrown upon the other crystals of the section. The weakest of the remaining crystals fails next, and so on until complete rupture of the piece is affected. This is called the theory of molecular disintegration.

If steel were a perfectly homogeneous substance, fatigue would be unknown. In searching for a remedy, therefore, we must first find out what contributes to the lack of homogeneity. Sulphur and phosphorus, present in the form of sulphides and phosphides of iron, exert a great weakening effect on the iron, and may, therefore, be set down as exerting a great influence on the fatigue of steel. Iron oxide also has a weakening effect. Any element that will take the above constituents out of the steel will contribute to the ability of steel to resist fatigue. Vanadium is that element.

When vanadium is added to a melt of steel, the first thing that happens is that the sulphur, phosphorus, and oxygen in combination with the iron

leave the iron and combine with the vanadium, their affinity for vanadium being greater than their affinity for iron. A slag is formed, which is easily separated from the remaining steel. The steel resulting has been found to offer a remarkable resistance to fatigue. In actual test a piece of carbon steel withstood 100 alternations of stress, while a piece of vanadium steel withstood 215 alternations, thus showing the beneficial effect of vanadium.

The introduction of vanadium steels makes it possible to design members subject to shock and repeated loadings with reasonable factors of safety with a reasonable certainty that the member will stand up. The manufacturer who makes his crankshafts and axles of vanadium steel can make them smaller and more cheaply than can his rival who uses the older carbon or nickle steels. He can also design the parts with more certainty and make his product comparatively free from the mysterious failures that have been the bugbear of users of ordinary steels.



## THE NECESSITY FOR ADEQUATE RAILWAY REVENUES

MARTIN A. KNAPP

An address by Martin A. Knapp, chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, at the annual dinner of the Railway Business Association, in New York, November 22, 1910.

The question of railroad rates; that is to say, of railroad revenues, involves vastly more than the direct interest of shippers or shareholders. In a very real sense, in a sense which is fortunately coming to be better understood, it is a great question of national policy second to none in its economic importance. Speaking only for myself, and without reference to the pending controversy over rate advances or any other concrete instance, I suggest three aspects of this question which are of immediate and intense public concern. If our country is to grow and prosper as it ought, if its untold resources are to be developed and its swelling numbers find profitable employment, we need and must have railway earnings sufficient for three things:

1st. A return on railway investments of such amount and so well assured as to attract and secure the necessary capital—an enormous sum in the aggregate—to improve existing roads and to con-

struct without delay thousands of miles of new lines in fruitful districts now destitute of any means of transportation. It is a matter of common knowledge that the output of traffic for the fiscal year 1907 exceeded our entire carrying capacity on land and water. With the rapid increase of population and of productive efficiency; that is, with a greater army of workers and better industrial organization, the volume of that year ought to be and will be nearly doubled in another decade if only we can provide for its prompt and proper distribution. And when we think of the rich regions yet unopened because unserved, when we recall, for example, that there is to-day in the old State of Maine a section larger than the whole of Massachusetts in which there is not a rod of railroad, must we not be impressed with a realization of pressing need and of boundless opportunity! Since it is our national policy—and long will be, I trust—to rely upon private capital and private enterprise to provide these great highways of commerce, to improve and multiply them in pace with our requirements, must we not in the larger public interest, whatever may be thought by this or that shipper, make the business of furnishing railroad transportation, which shall be up to the best standard of efficiency, convenience, and safety, so desirable to the investor that the necessary funds for betterments and extensions will be forthcoming, and so attractive as a vocation that the highest ability will be employed in its management? Otherwise, if unhappily this is

not done, must not our country come measurably to a standstill and face a future of comparative stagnation?

2d. The payment of liberal wages to an adequate number of competent men. This not only to insure increasing skill and reliability in a service which is all the while becoming more exacting, and on which the safety and comfort of the public constantly depend, but also because of the very great influence of railway wages upon the compensation of labor in every sphere and grade of private employment. To my mind the fundamental social problem is to provide, by the wise development of our institutions and without radical action or injustice, for a more equitable diffusion of the bountiful wealth which the earth produces. Now, as a large and increasing majority of the able bodied live, and must live, by working for others in some capacity, a high and advancing standard of payment for service of every sort tends strongly to promote, and is the best practical means to bring about that degree of equality in social welfare which makes for the satisfaction and happiness of all our people.

3d. The betterment of existing lines so as to greatly augment their serviceableness to the public, as can in varying degree be done everywhere, without unnecessary and undesirable increase in capitalization. Every dollar borrowed to improve a road now in operation involves a permanent addition to the interest charge which the public is required to pay; the improvement from current earn-

ings puts no lien upon the property but rather augments its value and usefulness, and by adding to the security of the capital already invested tends to a lower rate of interest upon that capital. Broadly speaking, this means a national policy, so to speak, in respect of railroad rates and revenues in harmony with our national policy in other matters of public concern, and in accordance with that enlarging spirit of altruism which manifests itself in public, as well as in private life, and which impels the present assumption of burdens that might be escaped or deferred in order that another generation may have an easier task and a larger opportunity. Is it not in this particular field a wise and patriotic policy?

## HOURS OF SERVICE OF RAILWAY EMPLOYEES

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE

Remarks of Robert M. La Follette in the Senate of the United States during the discussion of a bill to regulate the hours of service, June, 1906.

Mr. President, if there is an aroused public sentiment for legislative action at this time, it is because the public interest has been so long neglected.

The righteous appeals of the railway employees have been ignored and denied.

For nearly twenty-five years they have prayed for legislation to protect them against the negligence of the railway companies. The railway service is under the severest discipline. Employees are compelled to serve with the men the company hires. They cannot choose their associates. To offer any objection is to invite discharge. They suffer loss of life and limb in that service through the carelessness of co-employees and the negligence of the railway companies.

For nearly a quarter of a century they sought relief from Congress in vain. Is it to be marveled that the public is awakening to a sense of the wrong it has suffered? Shall its persistent and perfectly fair and reasonable demand for just legislation be rebuked as clamor and disease?

Every country in the world has recognized the demand for legislation that will make the employer respond in damages for the carelessness of the company and negligence or carelessness of the co-employee through whom an employee of the company receives injury. Yet the railroad employees of this country suffered without remedy until the present session, when a reasonably good bill passed this Congress, after a protracted struggle to defeat it.

So with the present bill. The railway employees have asked again and again for legislation placing a reasonable limit upon the number of hours of continued service beyond which they shall not be required to run trains. It is argued here that it can be left to contract between the railway companies and their employees. Every man who is at all familiar with the relations existing between railway employees and the companies knows perfectly well that whenever an engineer is called to take out his engine, whenever the call is made upon the train crew, no matter whether they have been on duty to the limit of human endurance, with scarcely an hour's rest, they must respond to that call. They cannot argue the matter with the railroad company. They cannot refuse to go out.

Of course they will not be discharged at once for such refusal. That would be a violation of the contract. But the refusal is noted on the record of such employee by the train dispatcher. Within a month or two, for some reason that cannot be con-

strued to be a violation of the contract entered into between the employee and the railroad company, the employee finds himself dismissed from the services, and dismissed under conditons that will not admit of his procuring employment with other companies.

The service of the railroad companies is in many respects a most difficult one. It is hazardous. It is a service in which the public is profoundly interested. This legislation is demanded because it is just to a faithful, intelligent, and courageous army of men and reasonable in its terms.

Furthermore, it is demanded because the public is deeply interested. It is vital to all who travel that the men who operate the railway trains of this country are in the best physical and mental condition. With scarcely an exception, every afternoon as the hands of the clock point to the hour of five, some Senator rises to entreat those in charge of legislation for an adjournment. They find themselves weary and exhausted with their attendance upon the session for a scant five hours. The Record is full of the complaints of Senators that they have been required to sit here through half the day.

Think of the engineer who takes out an engine at midnight for his long run. His employment may not be so exacting as that of Senators on this floor, but the alertness demanded, the concentration of all his faculties, is what wears upon the man. That engineer sits with hand on lever and throttle peering ahead, with all the faculties of his mind and all the

powers of his being concentrated on the safe conduct of that train to its destination. He has not only the strain which comes of nervous tension, of a constant apprehension of danger, but he has the weariness which comes with physical taxation. So with the fireman; so with the conductors. When those men have been on duty continuously for sixteen hours, how can any Senator argue that the law ought not fix a limitation beyond which they shall not be required to serve?

There has been no session of Congress for many years when this subject has not been earnestly pressed upon those charged with the responsibility of legislation. It is idle, it is belittling, for Senators to rise now, after having occupied the time of the Senate in various ways for the last few days, in order to prevent the consideration of this bill, with a pretense that here is a new proposition for the consideration of Congress. Why, sir, the President of the United States in every message, I think, since he came to that high office has recommended this legislation to Congress.

I read to the Senate two or three days ago, when this matter was under debate, a few words from the messages of President Roosevelt. In view of the character of the discussion here to-night I will repeat them now, because, if action upon this bill is prevented at this session of Congress, I shall do what I can here to-night to impress upon the country that it is in the face of the recommendation of the Interstate Commerce Commission, of the

recommendation of the Industrial Commission, of the appeals of railway employees of this country, whose petitions come from 194 of the largest brotherhoods of locomotive engineers in the country, which lie upon the table of the Senate, and of the recommendations of the President of the United States, who authorized me to-day to say on this floor that it was his earnest hope that the Senate would take action upon this bill, which is so reasonable in the limitations which it purposed to impose upon the railroads of the country.

In his message to the third session of the Fifty-eighth Congress, the President said :

I would also point out to the Congress the urgent need of legislation in the interest of the public safety, limiting the hours of labor for railroad employees in train service upon railroads engaged in interstate commerce.

In his message to this Congress, nothing having been done by the Congress pursuant to the message from which I have just quoted, he repeated the recommendation, and emphasized it in the following language :

The excessive hours of labor to which railroad employees in train service are in many cases subjected is also a matter which may well engage the serious attention of the Congress.

To some of the Senators, Mr. President, who have been participating in this discussion to-night, who have proclaimed from this floor to the country that

they have heard no demand for this legislation, I command these words of the President of the United States:

The strain, both mental and physical, upon those who are engaged in the movement and operation of railroad trains under modern conditions is perhaps greater than that which exists in any other industry, and if there are any reasons for limiting by law the hours of labor in any employment, they certainly apply with peculiar force to the employment of those upon whose vigilance and alertness in the performance of their duties the safety of all who travel by rail depends.

Mr. President, I want to suggest to those, who for many days have interposed every possible objection to a vote upon this bill, that in so doing they are assuming a grave responsibility. Scarcely a sun rises on this country that it does not witness some accident due to the fact that the railroad employees have been overtaxed in their service. If this legislation is to be withheld from the statute books at this session by methods such as have been employed here to defeat it, those who have engaged in that business will have to assume the responsibility for whatever casualties may befall the traveling public and the railway employees of this country which the passage of this bill might have served to prevent.

## THE RAILWAY RATE BILL

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE

A Speech by Robert M. La Follette in the Senate of the United States during the discussion of the railway rate bill in April, 1906.

Sir, this extended review of the evidence of increasing rates and vicious discrimination, of the methods of railroad building, overcapitalization, and reckless speculation, demonstrates the necessity of the valuation of railroad property as an indispensable basis for securing to the people of this country just and reasonable rates. Before this bill becomes a law I trust that the amendment which I shall offer, or some better one, will be incorporated, making full and complete provision at an early date for the true valuation of all the railroad property of the United States.

I cannot refrain from suggesting that the railroads of this country can no longer afford to oppose this valuation. It is best for them that it should be known. They contend that their railroads are worth the amount for which they are capitalized. The public contends that the capitalization is grossly in excess of the fair value and not a lawful basis for taxing transportation. This great issue between the public and the railroads can be juggled

with no longer. It cannot be settled by legislation which palliates the wrong. It must be settled by getting the true value, the fair value of railway property. If there is to be an end of antagonism and dissention between the people and the transportation companies, it can be found, sir, in no other way.

Mr. President, when it is remembered that the Interstate Commerce Commission is the only tribunal that stands between the railroads and the public; when it is considered that the power conferred upon the Commission is the power of Congress itself; that the Commission really represents the Government of the United States, and when we test the bill before us by the obligation of Congress to guard in full measure the public interest with all the sovereign power of the Federal Government, does not the proposed law seem to fall short of a just and comprehensive treatment of a great subject of legislation?

I would not be unfair. The bill is not bad in its provisions, but weak because of its omissions. I do not believe that the bill is framed to meet the demands of "special interests." Nor has any broad consideration of public interest dominated its construction.

It has neither ill intent nor high purpose. Expediency seems to have been the controlling factor in framing it.

It seems a response to the impelling necessity for *some* legislation.

It is probably just to the members of the committee who joined in reporting this bill to the Senate to say that it is their measure of the willingness of Congress to legislate on the subject; that it is as strong a bill as they believe could pass the Senate. But if this bill is not amended to meet the public need, if it should pass without being strengthened and improved, so as to make it a basis upon which to build substantially in the future, then it may as well be understood now that it will not quiet public interest nor prevent further demands. It will become *the issue of a new campaign*, more certain, more definite, and more specific than ever before.

This session of Congress will be but the preliminary skirmish of the great contest to follow. On the day that it is known that only the smallest possible measure of relief has been granted the movement will begin anew all over the country for a larger concession to public right. That movement *will not stop until it is completely successful*. The only basis upon which it can be settled finally in a free country is a control of the public-service corporations *broad enough, strong enough, and strict enough* to insure justice and equality to all American citizens.

Why pursue a shortsighted, temporizing course? Is it not worse than folly to believe that a country like ours, with all its glorious traditions, will surrender in this war for industrial independence?

Mr. President, the people of this generation have witnessed a revolution which has changed the in-

dustrial and commercial life of a nation. They have seen the business system of a century battered down, in violation of State and Federal statutes, and another builded on its ruins.

They know exactly what has happened and why it has happened.

The farmer knows that there is no open, free competitive market for anything he may produce upon his farm. He knows that he must accept the prices arbitrarily fixed by the beef trust and the elevator combination. He knows that both of these organizations have been given control of the markets by the railroads.

The independent manufacturer knows that he no longer has an open field and a fairly competitive chance to market his product against the trust, with its railroad interests.

The consumer knows that his prices are made for him by those who control the avenues of trade and the highways of commerce. The public has suffered much. It demands relief.

Mr. President, Senators in this discussion have avowed that they were not to be influenced by popular clamor; that they have no sympathy with bigotry that is blind to great railway enterprise and the value of the services which these corporations render to the public. It has been denounced as meddlesome interference for anyone to question the right of the railways to fix the markets of this country and to control the destination of its commerce. Public discussion in support of this legisla-

tion is rebuked as “noisy declamation,” and we are advised that public opinion should be scorned; that it is as shifting as the sands of the sea.

It has been suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge] that we might safely, from time to time, adopt “certain loose and general propositions” in the form of harmless resolutions, “which thunder in the index, and show that we are properly aroused to the dangers arising from corporations generally and from railroads in particular, and which do not commit us to any specific legislation.”

Sir, I respect public opinion. I do not fear it. I do not hold it in contempt. The public judgment of this great country forms slowly. It is intelligent. No body of men in this country is superior to it. In a representative democracy the common judgment of the majority must find expression in the law of the land. To deny this is to repudiate the principles upon which representative democracy is founded.

It is not prejudice nor clamor which is pressing this subject upon the attention of this body. It is a calm, well-considered public judgment. It is born of conviction—not passion—and it were wise for us to give it heed.

The public has reasoned out its case. For more than a generation of time it has wrought upon this great question with heart and brain in its daily contact with the great railway corporations. It has mastered all the facts. It is just. It is honest. It is rational. It respects property rights. It well

knows that its own industrial and commercial prosperity would suffer and decline if the railroads were wronged, their capital impaired, their profits unjustly diminished.

But the public refuses longer to recognize this subject as one which the railroads alone have the right to pass upon. It declines longer to approach it with awe. It no longer regards the railroad schedule as a mystery. It understands the meaning of rebates and "concessions," the evasions through "purchasing agents" and false weights, the subterfuge of "damage claims," the significance of "switching charges," "midnight tariffs," "milling in transit," "tap-line allowances," "underbilling," and "demurrage charges." It comprehends the device known as the "industrial railway," the "terminal railway," and all the tricks of inside companies, each levying tribute upon the traffic. It is quite familiar with the favoritism given to express companies, and knows exactly how producer and consumer have been handed over by the railroads, to be plundered by private car and refrigerator lines, in exchange for their traffic.

The public has gone even deeper into the subject. It knows that transportation is vital to organized society; that it is a function of government; that railway lines are the public highways to market; that these highways are established under the sanction of government; that the railway corporation dictates the location of its right-of-way, lays its tracks over the property of the citizen with-

out his consent, and that he must market the products of his capital and his labor over this highway, if at all, on the terms fixed by the railway corporation. Or, to say it arrogantly and brutally, as did the president of the Louisville and Nashville Railway Company in his testimony before the Interstate Commerce Commission, that the public can pay the charge which the railroad demands, "or it can walk." In short, sir, the public has come to understand that the railway corporation is a natural monopoly, which has been created by act of government, and that under existing conditions the public is completely at the mercy of this natural monopoly.

Because it is a natural monopoly, because it is the creature of government, it becomes the duty of government to see to it that the railway company inflicts no wrong upon the public, to compel it to do what is right, and to perform its office as a common carrier.

Sir, it is much easier to stand with these great interests than against them. This was true when Adam Smith wrote his *Wealth of Nations*, and it is true in 1906. Writing of the struggle with monopoly in the eighteenth century, he said:

The member of Parliament who supports every proposition for strengthening monopoly is sure to acquire great reputation for understanding trade, and also great popularity and influence with an order of men whose numbers and wealth render them of great importance. If he opposes them, on the contrary, and still more, if he have

authority enough to thwart them, neither the most acknowledged probity, nor the highest rank, nor the greatest public service, can protect him from the most infamous abuse and detraction, from personal insults, nor sometimes from real danger arising from the influence of furious and disappointed monopolists.

At no time in the history of any nation has it been so difficult to withstand these forces as it is right here in America to-day. Their power is acknowledged in every community and manifest in every lawmaking body. It is idle to ignore it. There exists all over this country a distrust of Congress, a fear that monopolistic wealth holds the balance of power in legislation.

Mr. President, I contend here, as I have contended upon the public platform in Wisconsin, and in other States, that the history of the last thirty years of struggle for just and equitable legislation demonstrates that the powerful combinations of organized wealth and special interests have had an overbalancing control in State and national legislation.

For a generation the American people have watched the growth of this power in legislation. They observe how vast and far-reaching these modern business methods are in fact. Against the natural laws of trade and commerce is set the arbitrary will of a few masters of special privilege. The principal transportation lines of the country are so operated as to eliminate competition. Between railroads and other monopolies controlling great natural resources and most of the necessities of life

there exists a "community of interests" in all cases and an identity of ownership in many. They have observed that these great combinations are closely associated in business for business reasons; that they are also closely associated in politics for business reasons; that together they constitute a complete system; that they encroach upon the public rights, defeat legislation for the public good, and secure laws to promote private interests.

Is it to be marveled at that the American people have become convinced that railroads and industrial trusts stand between them and their representatives; that they have come to believe that the daily conviction of public officials for betrayal of public trust in municipal, State, and national government is but a suggestion of the potential influence of these great combinations of wealth and power?

During this debate there has been much talk about the country having "hysteria." Magazine writers and press correspondents have been denounced, and there would seem to be an agreement that they are to be pursued and discredited, lest they lodge in the popular mind a wrongful estimate of the public service.

It does not lie in the power of any or all of the magazines of the country or of the press, great as it is, to destroy, without justification, the confidence of the people in the American Congress. Neither can any man on earth, whatever his position or power, alter the settled conviction of the intelligent citizenship of this country when it is grounded on

fact and experience. It rests solely with the United States Senate to fix and maintain its own reputation for fidelity to public trust. It will be judged by the record. It cannot repose in security upon its exalted position and the glorious heritage of its traditions. It is worse than folly to feel, or to profess to feel, indifferent with respect to public judgment. If public confidence is wanting in Congress, it is not of hasty growth, it is not the product of "jaundiced journalism." It is the result of years of disappointment and defeat. It is the outgrowth of a quarter of a century of keen, discriminating study of public questions, public records, and the lives of public men.

In the Supreme Court, midway between the Senate and the House, Mr. Justice Brewer has, for a quarter of a century, investigated, analyzed, and construed the legislative work of Congress. A keen and critical observer of men and events, he can speak with wisdom on the development and tendencies of the day, and no man will dare to say that he speaks in passion or with any ulterior purpose.

In an address on "The ethical obligation of the lawyer as a lawmaker," before the Albany Law School, June 1, 1904, he said:

No one can be blind to the fact that these mighty corporations are holding out most tempting inducements to lawmakers to regard in their lawmaking those interests rather than the welfare of the nation.

Senators and Representatives have owed their places to corporate influence, and that influence

has been exerted under an expectation, if not an understanding, that as lawmakers the corporate interests shall be subserved. . . .

The danger lies in the fact that they are so powerful and that the pressure of so much power upon the individual lawmaker tempts him to forget the nation and remember the corporation. And the danger is greater because it is insidious.

There may be no written agreement. There may be, in fact, no agreement at all, and yet, when the lawmaker understands that the power exists which may make for his advancement or otherwise and that it will be exerted according to the pliancy with which he yields to its solicitations, it lifts the corporation into a position of constant danger and menace to republican institutions.

For the first time in many years a great measure is before this body for its final action. The subject with which it deals goes to the very heart of the whole question. Out of railroad combination with monopoly and its power over legislation comes the perilous relation which Mr. Justice Brewer says "lifts the corporation into a position of constant danger and menace to republican institutions."

We have the opportunity to meet the demands of the hour, or we may weakly temporize while the storm continues to gather.

On Plymouth Rock eighty-six years ago Daniel Webster, looking with prophetic vision into the century beyond, uttered these words, which fall upon this day and generation as a solemn mandate:

As experience may show errors in our establishments we are bound to correct them, and if any practices exist contrary to the principles of justice and humanity within the reach of our laws or our influence, we are inexcusable if we do not exert ourselves to restrain and abolish them.

Mr. President, our responsibility is great; our duty is plain. If a true spirit of independent, patriotic service controls Congress, this bill will be reconstructed on the broad basis of public interest.

## ALASKA: THE NATION'S STOREHOUSE

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE

Remarks of Robert M. La Follette in the Senate of the United States, August 21, 1911.

Mr. President, the conservation of our natural resources is one of the most important problems of this generation. It is only recently that it has been generally realized that our natural resources are not inexhaustible.

Originally the public domain of the United States amounted in round numbers to 1,400,000,000 acres. Of this amount nearly all of the original domain available for agriculture and the greater part of our mineral wealth outside of Alaska has been disposed of, amounting in round numbers to more than 700,000,000 acres. Of this amount individuals and corporations have acquired more than 571,000,000 acres. Out of the 571,000,000 acres disposed of to individuals and corporations there have been acquired through the exercise of the homestead right only 115,000,000 acres. The railroads and other corporations had bestowed upon them by congressional grants, without any return whatever to the Government, in round numbers, 123,000,000 acres.

Many of the mistakes which have been made in

the States cannot be rectified. When remedies may be possible they may sometimes be found difficult of application. But in Alaska we still have a magnificent domain practically untouched, a domain consisting of 368,000,000 acres of land, an empire of wealth in coal and other mineral resources, the extent of which has not been determined. With the experience of the past, the waste of these resources, the turning of them over to speculation and monopoly would be a crime against the people of the United States. Here we have conditions permitting of true conservation without encountering the problems which confront us in considering the public domain in the States. These resources cannot to any great degree be developed by the individual man through the labor of his hands. Here are no vast tracts of agricultural lands to complicate the problem. It requires capital to develop these resources, and the question is, Shall the profit all go to private capital, or shall the people as a whole—the owners of these resources—with their own capital make possible such a development as will insure to the people their share of benefits?

Alaska was purchased with the people's money, taken from their common fund—the Treasury of the United States. Whatever of profit, whatever of advantage in any way accrues from that purchase belongs to all the people, and it will be the greatest crime of our generation if we permit it to be given over to Morgan, Guggenheim, and other great financial interests.

Whatever evidence or lack of evidence there may be as to the present intentions and maneuvers of corporate power in Alaska, our experience with the same forces nearer home teaches us that monopoly under these conditions is inevitable. Anyone who examines these documents must see that the foundations are being laid in Wall Street for the upbuilding of a monopoly in Alaska equal to that which controls the great anthracite coal fields of Pennsylvania. Here we have the same work of pioneers and prospectors, the same investors and mining companies, securing foothold and endeavoring to reach the market, but unable to induce capital to assume the risks of a contest with special interests, denied all hope of transportation and reasonable freight rates to reach markets. The same situation, if unchecked in Alaska, will develop in a very few years to the point of monopoly control which it required thirty years to reach in Pennsylvania.

Mr. President, the key to the whole situation is the control of the means of transportation.

The anthracite coal of the United States lies in three small fields in the State of Pennsylvania. Brought together into one body they would constitute a little strip of country eight miles by sixty—that is all of the anthracite coal outside of Alaska.

This little patch of anthracite coal to-day is owned, Mr. President, chiefly by one, and entirely, except a very small percentage of it, by two railroad companies. How did they acquire it? There was a time when it belonged to individuals who

were seeking to develop it. But in 1871 eight railroads tapped these coal fields. Not a pound of that coal could go to market except over the lines of these railroads.

These eight railroad companies conspired to take that coal land away from the individuals who owned it. How? They had absolute control of the only highways over which the coal could find its way to market. It was in their power to charge such transportation rates as they chose, to withhold cars if they saw fit, and in all the devious ways in which the business of the great transportation lines of the country may be operated to oppress shippers, to work their will and take over the property of the individual owners of those coal lands. They effected an organization; they proceeded to formulate rules and to enforce such hard conditions with respect to transportation as made it impossible for the men who owned the land to produce the coal and transport it to market at a profit. One after another these men were forced to the wall and compelled to surrender their property. The weakest went down first. Finally, the State of Pennsylvania, aroused at the wrong and injustice inflicted by the transportation companies upon the individual owners of these coal fields, called a convention and adopted an amendment to the State constitution the purpose of which was to put an end to these wrongs.

In 1873 the State of Pennsylvania wrote into its constitution a provision that no railroad company should acquire or own or operate mines or mining

lands. It put an express provision into the constitution limiting the rights of the railroads in the acquisition of real estate to land acquired solely for transportation purposes—a proper and a legitimate provision to write into organic and statutory law.

One would think that such a provision would have afforded protection and put an end to the tyranny and oppression of these railroads. It did not. They trampled under foot that constitutional provision; they paid no heed to it whatever; they went on acquiring control of these coal lands by oppression which has seldom been equaled in any country since society was organized and governments established. Men were ruined, their property taken from them at such a pittance as the railroad companies chose to pay for it, and, finally, Mr. President, a subservient Pennsylvania Legislature—and the Legislature of Pennsylvania has, with rare exceptions, been subservient to corporations—I say a subservient Pennsylvania Legislature, instead of enacting appropriate legislation for the enforcement of this constitutional provision, enacted a law forever preventing any of the lands thus acquired from escheating to the State. They gave immunity to these railroads—clothed them with an indefeasible title in these lands acquired in violation of the organic law of the State. The constitutional provision directed against railroad control of the coal fields required legislative enactment to make it operative, and the Legislature, instead of making it operative, strangled it and then passed a statute to

make secure the title of the railroads in these coal lands they had filched from the owners.

Thus it was that the tremendous power of freight discriminations first showed itself in the anthracite coal fields of Pennsylvania 40 years ago when it was employed to force ultimately the sale of 95 per cent. of all the individually owned anthracite coal lands to railroads owning and operating the only lines over which the coal could be transported to market.

We are now required to decide which of these two methods shall the American people adopt in Alaska. Shall we give Alaska over for the profit—the enormous and ever-increasing profit—of that great organization, now practically under the direction of a single mind in this country, controlling the credits, the transportation, the industrial organizations, the franchise institutions of the country? Will the American people be so blind, so dull, as to permit this enormously rich field of Alaska to become the property of Morgan and those allied with him, and thus force all the great western country and the millions who are to people it in the generations to come to pay such extortionate prices for coal as that power will certainly exact, or will the people of this country, who own Alaska, see to it that this great storehouse of wealth shall be used for the benefit of all the people, their children, and their children's children for all time?

The American people are the owners of the resources of Alaska. These have been preserved

up to the present time by withdrawing them from occupation and use. The people now clamor for their use and for the development which is essential to their use. They are entitled to get the benefit of the reduction in the cost of living which will come from a utilization of Alaska's treasures. The whole Pacific coast demands access to the enormous coal deposits. The people east of the Rocky Mountains will gain by their development. Even the Navy Department of the Federal Government is compelled to pay \$9 to \$12 for coal on the Pacific coast which costs \$3 to \$4 on the Atlantic coast. The tests which have been made show that samples of coal from veins as thick as 33 feet in the Controller Bay region have a higher heating value than coal secured by the Navy Department on the eastern tide-water.

The problem then remaining is how to administer this great estate. The example of Panama points the way. Congress, of course, cannot deal with this subject in all of its details nor assume the management of the development of our resources in Alaska. The same reasons which prevent Congress from undertaking supervision apply practically with equal force to the President, the Interior Department and the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The sensible and practical thing to do is to create a board of public works for Alaska, to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, similar to the Isthmian Canal Commission. This board of public works should then undertake, not merely

to build a railroad from Controller Bay to the coal fields, but it should now acquire all of the railroads in Alaska, and settle at once the policy of governmental ownership. It should similarly provide for the development of other public utilities, such as the telegraph and telephone. It should operate and develop the wharves and docks and steamship lines, if necessary, to deliver the products of Alaska to the Pacific coast. The Morgan-Guggenheims, accustomed to the highest profits on their investments, and demanding to a great extent immediate returns, must make exorbitant and oppressive charges. The people of the United States do not demand an immediate return. They can themselves supply all necessary money at an interest charge of less than 3 per cent. Rates for transportation and for other public utilities may properly be low, with the capital cost as small as the investment would be to the people. Most important of all is control of the transportation facilities by the Government. It would forever remove the irresistible temptation of discrimination, rebates, and corruption which have characterized the worst period of our railroad operation.

The whole situation is summed up in the Republican platform of Wisconsin, adopted September, 1910, which says:

The attempt of private monopoly to steal the Alaskan coal fields was defeated for the time being through the efforts of a few courageous officials whose sacrifice and devotion to duty furnish an example worthy of emulation in every depart-

ment and rank of the public service. Failing to secure the coal fields through perjury and fraud, special interests will exploit them through a monopoly of transportation. The title to the coal fields of Alaska should be forever retained by the Government, subject to lease under proper regulation. The situation of Alaska is exceptional. Transportation is the basis of control. It is the key to this vast territory of treasure. As exceptional conditions in Panama require the Government of the United States to own and operate a railroad on the Isthmus in order to protect its interests and the interests of shippers, so we hold that exceptional conditions in Alaska require that the Federal Government should construct, own, and operate the railroads, docks, and steamship lines necessary to the opening up of the Alaska coal fields and other natural resources.

With a law such as I have indicated, the Government owning the railroads, the direct operation or leasing of the coal fields under proper regulations, insuring a proper revenue to the Government for the benefit of the people, and proper regulations that will protect the consumer, all under the management of a board of experts having in mind only the public interest, I believe that the problem of conservation of our natural resources in Alaska will be solved and that its administration there will be of great aid to us in securing solutions for some of the problems which confront us in considering the conservation of such natural resources as are still a part of the public domain in the States.



## ON WITHDRAWING FROM THE UNION

JEFFERSON DAVIS

A part of the speech delivered by Jefferson Davis in the United States Senate, January 21, 1861.

[According to Edward A. Pollard in "The Life of Jefferson Davis," it was in the Senate of the United States, the highest school of eloquence in America, that Mr. Davis formed his style. His was the oratory delivered to the few and cultivated. He had a wealth of words that were both forceful and polished, coupled with a rich, manly eloquence." He spoke very deliberately, "sometimes with majestic slowness pouring out his wealth of eloquence." Mr. Davis had above all else that which constitutes the highest art of oratory, "self-countenance in the expression of passion."]

I rise, Mr. President, for the purpose of announcing to the Senate that I have satisfactory evidence that the State of Mississippi, by a solemn ordinance of her people in convention assembled, has declared her separation from the United States. Under these circumstances, of course my functions are terminated here. It has seemed to me proper, however, that I should appear in the Senate to announce that fact to my associates.

It is known to senators who have served with me here that I have for many years advocated, as an essential attribute of State sovereignty, the right of a State to secede from the Union. I hope none who hear me will confound this expression of mine with

the advocacy of a State to remain in the Union, and to disregard its constitutional obligation by the nullification of the law. Such is not my theory. Nullification and secession, so often confounded, are indeed antagonistic principles. Nullification is a remedy which it is sought to apply within the Union, and against the agent of the States. Secession belongs to a different class of remedies. It is to be justified upon the basis that the States are sovereign. I therefore say I concur in the action of the people of Mississippi, believing it to be necessary and proper, and should have been bound by their action if my belief had been otherwise; and this brings me to the important point which I wish on this last occasion to present to the Senate. A State finding herself in the condition in which Mississippi has judged she is, in which her safety requires that she should provide for the maintenance of her rights out of the Union, surrenders all the benefits (and they are known to be many), deprives herself of the advantages (they are known to be great), severs all the ties of affection (and they are close and enduring), which have bound her to the Union; and thus divesting herself of every benefit, taking upon herself every burden, she claims to be exempt from any power to execute the laws of the United States within her limits.

I well remember an occasion when Massachusetts was arraigned before the bar of the Senate, and when then the doctrine of coercion was rife and to be applied against her because of the rescue of a

fugitive slave in Boston. My opinion then was the same that it is now. I then said, if Massachusetts, following her through a stated line of conduct, chooses to take the last step which separates her from the Union, it is her right to go, and I will neither vote one dollar nor one man to coerce her back; but will say to her, God-speed, in memory of the kind associations which once existed between her and the other States.

I find in myself, perhaps, a type of the general feeling of my constituents toward yours. I am sure I feel no hostility to you, senators from the North. I am sure there is not one of you, whatever sharp discussion there may have been between us, to whom I cannot now say, in the presence of my God, I wish you well; and such, I am sure, is the feeling of the people whom I represent toward those whom you represent. I therefore feel that I but express their desire when I say I hope, and they hope, for peaceful relations with you, tho' we must part. They may be mutually beneficial to us in the future, as they have been in the past, if you so will it. The reverse may bring disaster on every portion of the country; and if you will have it thus, we will invoke the God of our fathers, who delivered them from the power of the lion, to protect us from the ravages of the bear; and thus, putting our trust in God, and in our firm hearts and strong arms, we will vindicate the right as best we may.

In the course of my service here, associated at different times with a great variety of senators, I

see now around me some with whom I have served long; there have been points of collision; but whatever of offense there has been to me, I leave here; I carry with me no hostile remembrance. Whatever offense I have given which has not been redressed, or for which satisfaction has not been demanded, I have, senators, in this hour of our parting, to offer you my apology for any pain which, in heat of discussion, I have inflicted. I go hence unencumbered of the remembrance of any injury received, and having discharged the duty of making the only reparation in my power for any injury offered.

Mr. President and Senators, having made the announcement which the occasion seemed to me to require, it only remains for me to bid you a final adieu.

## PAUL BEFORE AGRIPPA<sup>1</sup>

To conciliate the Jews, whom Paul had angered by his bold speaking, the Roman governor, Felix, had kept him in prison for two years. When Pontius Festus took Felix' place, however, he had Paul brought before him, and on Paul's appealing to the judgment of Caesar, prepared to send him to Rome. As King Agrippa came to visit him at this time, however, Festus placed Paul before his noble guest. Then Agrippa said unto Paul:

Thou art permitted to speak for thyself.

Then Paul stretched out his hand, and answered for himself with such effect that Agrippa said to him, "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian," and to Festus later, "This man might have been set at liberty if he had not appealed unto Caesar."

I think myself happy, King Agrippa, because I shall answer for myself this day before thee touching all the things whereof I am accused of the Jews: Especially because I know thee to be expert in all customs and questions which are among the Jews: wherefore I beseech thee to hear me patiently. My manner of life from my youth, which was at the first among mine own nation at Jerusalem, know all the Jews; which knew me from the beginning, if they would testify, that after the most straitest sect of our religion I lived a Pharisee. And now I stand and am judged for the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers: unto which promise

<sup>1</sup>The group of short speeches from the Scriptures are included in this volume as examples of vivid imagery and rare choice of words.

our twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hope to come. For which hope's sake, King Agrippa, I am accused of the Jews.

Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you, that God should raise the dead?

I verily thought with myself that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth. Which thing I did also in Jerusalem: and many of the saints did I shut up in prison, having received authority from the chief priests; and when they were put to death, I gave my voice against them. And I punished them oft in every synagogue, and compelled them to blaspheme; and being exceedingly mad against them, I persecuted them even unto strange cities. Whereupon as I went to Damascus with authority and commission from the chief priests, at midday, O king, I saw in the way a light from heaven, above the brightness of the sun, shining round about me and them which journeyed with me. And when we were all fallen to the earth, I heard a voice speaking unto me, and saying in the Hebrew tongue, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks.

And I said, Who art thou, Lord?

And he said, I am Jesus, whom thou persecutest. But rise, and stand upon thy feet; for I have appeared unto thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister and a witness both of those things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee; delivering thee from the

people, and from the Gentiles, unto whom now I send thee. To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me.

Whereupon, O King Agrippa, I was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision; but shewed first unto them of Damascas, and at Jerusalem, and throughout the coast of Judea, and then to the Gentiles, that they should repent and turn to God, and do works meet for repentance. For these causes the Jews caught me in the temple, and went about to kill me.

Having obtained help of God, I continue unto this day, witnessing both to small and great, saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come: That Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead, and should shew light unto the people and to the Gentiles.—*Acts 26: 1-23.*



## PAUL AT MARS HILL

Paul, on one of his missionary journeys, came to Athens, where he was received with eager curiosity. Presently some philosophers of the Epicureans and of the Stoics encountered him, and after arguing a while, took him to Mars' Hill, and asked him to expound his views more fully. Then Paul stood in the midst of Mars' Hill, and said :

Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious. For as I passed by, and beheld your devotions, I found an altar with this inscription, *To the unknown God*. Whom, therefore, ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you. God, that made the world and all things therein, seeing that he is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands; neither is worshipped with men's hands, as though he needed anything, seeing he giveth to all life, and breath and all things; and hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation; that they might seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him and find him, though he be not far from every one of us; For in him we live and move, and have our being; as certain also of your own poets have said, for we are also his offspring.

Forasmuch, then, as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like

unto gold or silver or stone, graven by art of man's device. And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent; because he hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead.—*Acts 16: 22-31.*

## NATHAN'S PARABLE OF THE EWE LAMB

King David wished to marry the wife of Uriah, one of his generals, and in order to carry out his wishes as quickly as possible, had Uriah set in "the forefront of the hottest battle," an honorable position which was almost certain death. Uriah was killed, and David married his widow as soon as the law allowed. But the thing that David had done displeased the Lord, and the Lord sent Nathan unto David, and he said unto him:

There were two men in one city: the one rich, and the other poor. The rich man had exceeding many flocks and herds: But the poor man had nothing save one little ewe lamb, which he had bought and nourished up; and it grew up together with him, and with his children; it did eat of his own meat, and drank of his cup, and lay in his bosom, and was unto him as a daughter.

And there came a traveller unto the rich man, and he spared to take of his own flock and of his own herd to dress for the wayfaring man that was come unto him; but took the poor man's lamb, and dressed it for the man that was come to him.

Then the angry king demanded the name of the rich man, that he might be punished. And Nathan said to David, Thou art the man.—*II Samuel, 12: 1-12.*



## TERTULLUS' SPEECH AGAINST PAUL

The Apostle Paul, because of his bold speaking in Jerusalem, was in danger of being killed by the Jews, but was rescued by the Romans and sent to the Roman governor, Felix, at Caesarea. Here he was tried, an orator named Tertullus being his chief accuser. And when Paul was called forth, Tertullus began to accuse him, saying:

Seeing that by thee we enjoy great quietness, and that very worthy deeds are done unto this nation by thy providence, we accept it always, and in all places, most noble Felix, with all thankfulness. Notwithstanding, that I be not further tedious to thee, I pray thee that thou wouldest hear us of thy clemency a few words.

For we have found this man a pestilent fellow, and a mover of sedition among all the Jews throughout the world, and a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes; who also hath gone about to profane the temple: whom we took and would have judged according to our law. But the chief captain Lysias came upon us, and with great violence took him away out of our hands, commanding his accusers to come unto thee; by examining of whom thyself mayest take knowledge of all these things whereof we accuse him.—*Acts 24. 2-8.*



## PAUL'S REPLY TO TERTULLUS

In answer to the speech made against him by Tertullus, before the Roman governor, Felix, Paul, after that the governor had beckoned him to speak, answered :

Forasmuch as I know that thou hast been of many years a judge unto this nation, I do the more cheerfully answer for myself; because that thou mayest understand that there are yet but twelve days since I went up to Jerusalem for to worship. And they neither found me in the temple disputing with any man, neither raising up the people, neither in the synagogues, nor in the city; neither can they prove the things whereof they now accuse me.

But this I confess unto thee, that after the way which they call heresy so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and in the prophets: and have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust. And herein do I exercise myself, to have always a conscience void of offense toward God and toward man.

Now, after many years I came to bring alms to my nation and offerings. Whereupon certain Jews from Asia found me purified in the temple, neither with multitude, nor with tumult. Who ought to have been here before thee, and object, if they had

aught against me. Or else let these same here say, if they have found any evil doing in me, while I stood before the council, except it be for this one voice, that I cried standing among them, touching the resurrection of the dead I am called in question by you this day.—*Acts 24: 10-21.*

## JULIA WARD HOWE

CHARLES W. ELIOT

Remarks of Charles W. Eliot at the obsequies of Julia Ward Howe.

This is not the time or place for studied eulogy, nor can any single voice express the depth of feeling that has drawn this company together. We are gathered here simply to bring our tribute of gratitude and reverence. Each one of us has some particular reason for grateful appreciation; but, whatever may be the separate and individual ties that have bound us in love and honor to Mrs. Howe, all of us alike share the impression of the richness and abundance of her nature and the prodigality of her gifts.

The Scripture phrase which one thinks of in connection with this life is the word of the Master, "I am come that ye may have life and have it more abundantly." This is a career that speaks to us of the abundance of life, of richness of experience, of completed roundness of character and achievement, of rare gifts nobly used. Here was a life rich in aspiration and accomplishment, rich in love given and received, rich in widespread and penetrating influence, a life radiant with encouragement to the end.

She passed through the changeful experiences of more than ninety fruitful years,—the happy days of sheltered childhood, the years of brilliant and beautiful youth, the sacred obligations of wife and mother, the varied experiences of ceaseless philanthropic labors, the fascinating diversity of social relationships, the applause of listening thousands, the accumulated honors of age. She enriched our literature. She inspired our patriotism. She up-built our ideals alike of domestic fidelity and happiness and of public-spirited service. She was interested in everything,—in nature, in events, in persons, in causes, in truth. She loved the New England landscape and delightedly explored the mysterious processes of the world of nature, its beautiful adaptations, its precise and orderly laws. She was interested in the welfare of all her fellow-beings, ready to rejoice with the glad, eager to help the down-trodden and oppressed everywhere. She was interested in philosophy and pursued truth all her days, calmly, but eagerly. She found truths that sustained her in all the vicissitudes of experience. She had confidence in goodness, in its reality, its permanence, its power to conquer evil. She had confidence in love as the supreme reality.

She believed in conscientious work and never despaired of a cause because it was unpopular. She had an overflowing sympathy, broad as humanity, including white and black, Greek and Armenian, bond and free. Her mind was affirmative. She said "Yes" more often than she said "No." She

had faith, not opinions or dead beliefs, but faith—a faith which saw God present in nature, present in Providence, present in the souls of men; which found Him in all changes, in all joys and sorrows, in the immediate duty of the hour, in the large visions of the ages.

Mrs. Howe enjoyed all the privileges of the abundant life while she avoided its perils. Many a scholar there is to whom knowledge has come, but from whom wisdom has stayed away, who has grown less human as his learning increased; but with Mrs. Howe experience was always applied; it was sacred as a gift of God, and its purpose was to enlarge serviceableness, to multiply points of contact with the needs of humanity.

Her life was abundant in friendship and in public and private honor, but she depended neither upon praise nor blame. She was far from insensible to the admiration that surrounded her, but it never spoiled her. She accepted her place in people's hearts simply and naturally, thankfully recognized her privileges and trusted the obligations they imposed to keep her from vainglory. No lot is too rich, no gifts too abundant for a soul that enters into its privileges full of humility before God, love for humanity and deep desire of helpfulness.

She lived always in the inspiration of great convictions and with a happy trust in the heart of the universe. But her spiritual gifts were not luxuries for her own use, but trusts for her fellowmen. Her

thought each day was not what the world could do for her, but what she could do for the world.

She found the joy of life in the use of her rare endowments. Hers was the gift of humor. Many a cloud was driven away by the bright spirit of laughter. Hers was the gift of bounteous, all-embracing hospitality—of mind and heart and home. She had a real democracy of soul which counted nothing human as foreign to her. Hers was the gift of interpretation. She knew how to turn sight into insight. She could discover the possibilities of poetry in the meanest events and emergencies. Hers was the gift of communication, the power of solving and persuasive speech. She transmitted that which she received. She could say in her prayer, "The glory thou hast given me I have given to them."

She found the rewards of life in life itself, in the enrichment of experience, the new opportunities of attainment and service. Her good obtained was only tidings of something better. The richest joy of her life was the discovery of her capacity to inspire and impart life.

Too often we have been told that the Christian life is one of renunciation and self-denial, the giving up of pleasures or of freedom of thought and action. That was not her way of looking at things. The Christian ideal to her was not one of negation, but of appreciation; not of renunciation, but of the use of the gifts of God. Religion to her meant not subtraction, but addition; not diminution of power, but

multiplication of freedom and power and joy. To accept the privilege of life with an alert body, an open mind, a sensitive imagination, and a steadfast will, that was to her the Father's business in which she had a partnership.

I think not only of the abundance of this life, but of its perfect poise,—a quality which grows more and more beautiful as we tire of the fantastic and one-sided types of character which the world often admires. Hers was not only fulness of life, but symmetry of life. She was expectant without impatience, progressive, but always ready to wait, full of confidence, but never arrogant, serene, but enthusiastic.

So much of the noblest life disappoints us with its partialness. So many people we admire are great only upon certain sides and in other aspects are comparatively small. The more do we value a human life rich and full and strong all around. Here was life where the length and breadth and height were equal. By length of life I do not mean its mere duration, but the reaching on and out of a soul on the lines of its special powers, the impulse of a life toward the ends that it was meant to serve. The breadth of a life is its outreach in human sympathy, and the height of a life is its reach upward, its consciousness of divine realities, its sense of communion with and commission from God. Length without breadth may be hard and narrow; breadth without length may be thin and shallow; length and breadth without height may be flat and un-

profitable. Here was a soul which conceived distinct purposes, yet which found in its earnest efforts to fulfill its own career the interpretation of the careers of other souls and the transfiguration of its own experience.

The secret of her amazing vitality and widespread usefulness was that she kept always in contact with the real and permanent sources of power. The dynamic of duty and faith and love worked through her. The subtle mystery of the life eternal flowed through her nature and her experience out into the complicated mechanism of the life of the world about her.

With glad hearts we have all remarked the exceptional vitality of her powers in old age. That meant simply that she had begun to live the eternal life here and now, the kind of life that does not decay or change, the life which is not merely future existence, but present renewal in the Spirit.

Not long ago she said to her beloved minister, Dr. Ames: "The lower I drain the cup of life, the sweeter it grows. All the sugar is at the bottom." Her graceful verse repeats the same satisfaction:

"I have made a voyage upon a golden river,  
'Neath clouds of opal and of amethyst.  
Along its banks bright shapes were moving ever,  
And threatening shadows melted into mist.

My journey nears its close: in some still haven  
My bark shall find its anchorage of rest,  
When the kind Hand, which every good has given,  
Opening with wider grace, shall give the best."

## THE DEATH OF LINCOLN

JAMES A. GARFIELD

On April 15, 1865, James A. Garfield, from the balcony of the New York Custom House, quieted a mob frenzied by the news of President Lincoln's assassination by this brief and remarkable utterance:

“Fellow citizens: Clouds and darkness are around Him; His pavilion is dark waters and thick clouds; justice and judgment are the establishment of His throne; mercy and truth shall go before His face!

“Fellow citizens, God reigns, and the Government at Washington lives!”



## THE BIBLE AND PROGRESS

WOODROW WILSON

Address of Hon. Woodrow Wilson, Governor of New Jersey, in the Auditorium, Denver, Col., on the occasion of the tercentenary celebration of the translation of the Bible into the English language, May 7, 1911.

The thought that entered my mind first as I came into this great room this evening framed itself in a question—Why should this great body of people have come together upon this solemn night? There is nothing here to be seen. There is nothing delectable here to be heard. Why should you run together in a great host when all that is to be spoken of is the history of a familiar book?

But as I have sat and looked upon this great body of people I have thought of the very suitable circumstance that here upon the platform sat a little group of ministers of the gospel lost in this great throng.

I say the “suitable circumstance,” for I come here to-night to speak of the Bible as the book of the people, not the book of the minister of the gospel, not the special book of the priest from which to set forth some occult, unknown doctrine withheld from the common understanding of men, but a great book of revelation—the people’s book of revelation. For it seems to me that the Bible has revealed the peo-

ple to themselves. I wonder how many persons in this great audience realize the significance for English-speaking peoples of the translation of the Bible into the English tongue. Up to the time of the translation of the Bible into English it was a book for long ages withheld from the perusal of the people of other languages and of other tongues, and not a little of the history of liberty lies in the circumstance that the moving sentences of this book were made familiar to the ears and the understanding of those peoples who have led mankind in exhibiting the forms of government and the impulses of reform which have made for freedom and for self-government among mankind.

For this is a book which reveals men unto themselves, not as creatures in bondage, not as men under human authority, not as those bidden to take counsel and command of any human source. It reveals every man to himself as a distinct moral agent, responsible not to men, not even to those men whom he has put over him in authority, but responsible through his own conscience to his Lord and Maker. Whenever a man sees this vision he stands up a free man, whatever may be the government under which he lives. If he sees beyond the circumstances of his own life.

I heard a very eloquent sermon to-day from an honored gentleman who is with us to-night. He was speaking upon the effect of a knowledge of the future life upon our conduct in this life. And it seemed to me that as I listened to him I saw the

flames of those fires rekindled at which the martyrs died—died forgetful of their pain, with praise and thanksgiving upon their lips, that they had the opportunity to render their testimony that this was not the life for which they had lived, but that there was a house builded in the heavens, not built of men but built of God, to the vision of which they had lifted their eyes as they passed through the world, which gave them courage to fear no man but to serve God. And I thought that all the records of heroism of the great things that had illustrated human life were summed up in the power of men to see that vision.

Our present life, ladies and gentlemen, is a very imperfect and disappointing thing. We do not judge our own conduct in the privacy of our own closets by the standards of expediency by which we are daily and hourly governed. We know that there is a standard set for us in the heavens, a standard revealed to us in this book which is the fixed and eternal standard by which we judge ourselves, and as we read this book it seems to us that the pages of our own hearts are laid open before us for our own perusal. This is the people's book of revelation, revelation of themselves not alone, but revelation of life and of peace. You know that human life is a constant struggle. For a man who has lost the sense of struggle, life has ceased.

I believe that my confidence in the judgment of the people in matters political is based upon my knowledge that the men who are struggling are the

men who know; that the men who are in the midst of the great effort to keep themselves steady in the pressure and rush of life are the men who know the significance of the pressure and the rush of life, and that they, the men on the make, are the men to whom to go for your judgments of what life is and what its problems are. And in this book there is peace simply because we read here the object of the struggle. No man is satisfied with himself as the object of the struggle.

There is a very interesting phrase that constantly comes to our lips which we perhaps do not often enough interpret in its true meaning. We see many a young man start out in life with apparently only this object in view—to make name and fame and power for himself, and there comes a time of maturity and reflection when we say of him, "He has come to himself." When may I say that I have come to myself? Only when I have come to recognize my true relations with the rest of the world. We speak of a man losing himself in a desert. If you reflect a moment you will see that is the only thing he has not lost. He himself is there. What he means when he says that he has lost himself is that he has lost all the rest of the world. He has nothing to steer by. He does not know where any human habitation lies. He does not know where any beaten path and highway is. If he could establish his relationship with anything else in the world he would have found himself. Let it serve as a picture.

A man has found himself when he has found his relation to the rest of the universe, and here is the book in which those relations are set forth. And so when you see a man going along the highways of life with his gaze lifted above the road, lifted to the sloping ways in front of him, then be careful of that man and get out of his way. He knows the kingdom for which he is bound. He has seen the revelation of himself and of his relations to mankind. He has seen the revelations of his relation to God and his Maker and therefore he has seen his responsibility in the world. This is the revelation of life and of peace. I do not know that peace lies in constant accommodation. I was once asked if I would take part in a great peace conference, and I said, "Yes, if I may speak in favor of war"—not the war which we seek to avoid, not the senseless and useless and passionate shedding of human blood, but the only war that brings peace, the war with human passions and the war with human wrong—the war which is that untiring and unending process of reform from which no man can refrain and get peace.

No man can sit down and withhold his hands from the warfare against wrong and get peace out of his acquiescence. The most solid and satisfying peace is that which comes from this constant spiritual warfare, and there are times in the history of nations when they must take up the crude instruments of bloodshed in order to vindicate spiritual conceptions. For liberty is a spiritual conception,

and when men take up arms to set other men free, there is something sacred and holy in the warfare. I will not cry "Peace" so long as there is sin and wrong in the world. And this great book does not teach any doctrine of peace so long as there is sin to be combatted and overcome in one's own heart and in the great moving force of human society.

And so it seems to me that we must look upon the Bible as the great charter of the human soul—as the "Magna Charta" of the human soul. You know the interesting circumstances which gave rise to the Magna Charta. You know the moving scene that was enacted upon the heath at Runnymede. You know how the barons of England, representing the people of England—for they consciously represented the people of England—met upon that historic spot and parleyed with John the king. They said: "We will come to terms with you here." They said: "There are certain inalienable rights of English-speaking men which you must observe. They are not given by you, they cannot be taken away by you. Sign your name here to this parchment upon which these rights are written and we are your subjects. Refuse to put your name to this document and we are your sworn enemies. Here are our swords to prove it."

The franchises of human liberty made the basis of a bargain with a king! There are kings upon the pages of Scripture, but do you think of any king in Scripture as anything else than a mere man? There was the great King David, of a line blessed

because the line from which should spring our Lord and Saviour, a man marked in the history of mankind as the chosen instrument of God to do justice and exalt righteousness in the people.

But what does this Bible do for David? Does it utter eulogies upon him? Does it conceal his faults and magnify his virtues? Does it set him up as a great statesman would be set up in a modern biography? No, the book in which his annals are written strips the mask from David, strips every shred of counterfeit and concealment from him and shows him as indeed an instrument of God, but a sinful and selfish man, and the verdict of the Bible is that David, like other men, was one day to stand naked before the judgment seat of God and be judged not as a king, but as a man. Isn't this the book of the people? Is there any man in this Holy Scripture who is exempted from the common standard and judgment? How these pages teem with the masses of mankind! Are these the annals of the great? These are the annals of the people—of the common run of men.

The New Testament is the history of the life and the testimony of common men who rallied to the fellowship of Jesus Christ and who by their faith and preaching remade a world that was under the thrall of the Roman army. This is the history of the triumph of the human spirit in the persons of humble men. And how many sorts of men march across the pages, how infinite is the variety of human circumstance and of human dealings and of

human heroism and love! Is this a picture of extraordinary things? This is a picture of the common life of mankind. It is a mirror held up for men's hearts, and it is in this mirror that we marvel to see ourselves portrayed.

How like to the Scripture is all great literature! What is it that entrances us when we read or witness a play of Shakespeare? It is the consciousness that this man, this all-observing mind, saw men of every cast and kind as they were in their habits as they lived. And as passage succeeds passage we seem to see the characters of ourselves and our friends portrayed by this ancient writer, and a play of Shakespeare is just as modern to-day as upon the day it was penned and first enacted. And the Bible is without age or date or time. It is a picture of the human heart displayed for all ages and for all sorts and conditions of men. Moreover, the Bible does what is so invaluable in human life—it classifies moral values. It apprises us that men are not judged according to their wits, but according to their characters.

That the last of every man's reputation is his truthfulness, his squaring his conduct with the standards that he knew to be the standards of purity and rectitude.

How many a man we appraise, ladies and gentlemen, as great to-day whom we do not admire as noble! A man may have great power and small character. And the sweet praise of mankind lies not in their admiration of the smartness with which

the thing was accomplished, but in that lingering love which apprises men that one of their fellows has gone out of life to his own reckoning, where he is sure of the blessed verdict: "Well done, good and faithful servant."

Did you ever look about you in any great city, in any great capitol, at the statues which have been erected in it? To whom are these statues erected? Are they erected to the men who have piled fortunes about them? I do not know of any such statue anywhere unless after he had accumulated his fortune the man bestowed it in beneficence upon his fellowmen and alongside of him will stand a statue of another meaning, for it is easy to give money away. I heard a friend of mine say that the standard of generosity was not the amount you gave away, but the amount you had left. It is easy to give away of your abundance, but look at the next statue, the next statue and the next in the market-place of great cities and whom will you see? You will see here a soldier who gave his life to serve, not his own ends, but the interests and the purposes of his country.

I would be the last, ladies and gentlemen, to disparage any of the ordinary occupations of life, but I want to ask you this question: Did you ever see anybody who had lost a son hang up his yardstick over the mantel-piece? Have you not seen many families who had lost their sons hang up their muskets and their swords over the mantel-piece? What is the difference between the yardstick and the

musket? There is nothing but perfect honor in the use of the yardstick, but the yardstick was used for the man's own interest, for his own self-support. It was used merely to fulfil the necessary exigencies of life, whereas the musket was used to serve no possible purpose of his own. He took every risk without any possibility of profit. The musket is the symbol of self-sacrifice and the yardstick is not. A man will instinctively elevate the one as the symbol of honor and never dream of using the other as a symbol of distinction.

Doesn't that cut pretty deep, and don't you know why the soldier has his monument as against the civilian's? The civilian may have served his State—he also—and here and there you may see a statesman's statue, but the civilian has generally served his country—has often served his country, at any rate—with some idea of promoting his own interests, whereas the soldier has everything to lose and nothing but the gratitude of his fellowmen to win.

Let every man pray that he may in some true sense be a soldier of fortune, that he may have the good fortune to spend his energies and his life in the service of his fellowmen in order that he may die to be recorded upon the rolls of those who have not thought of themselves but have thought of those whom they served. Isn't this the lesson of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ? Am I not reminding you of these common judgments of our life, simply expounding to you this book of revelation, this book which reveals the common man to himself,

which strips life of its disguises and its pretences and elevates those standards by which alone true greatness and true strength and true valor are assessed?

Do you wonder, therefore, that when I was asked what my theme this evening would be I said it would be "The Bible and Progress"? We do not judge progress by material standards. America is not ahead of the other nations of the world because she is rich. Nothing makes America great except her thoughts, except her ideals, except her acceptance of those standards of judgment which are written large upon these pages of revelation. America has all along claimed the distinction of setting this example to the civilized world—that men were to think of one another, that governments were to be set up for the service of the people, that men were to be judged by these moral standards which pay no regard to rank or birth or conditions, but which assess every man according to his single and individual value. This is the meaning of this charter of the human soul. This is the standard by which men and nations have more and more come to be judged. And so the form has consisted in nothing more nor less than this—in trying to conform actual conditions, in trying to square actual laws with the right judgments of human conduct and more than liberty.

That is the reason that the Bible has stood at the back of progress. That is the reason that reform has come not from the top but from the bottom.

If you are ever tempted to let a government reform itself, I ask you to look back in the pages of history and find me a government that reformed itself. If you are ever tempted to let a party attempt to reform itself I ask you to find a party that ever reformed itself.

A tree is not nourished by its bloom and by its fruit. It is nourished by its roots, which are down deep in the common and hidden soil, and every process of purification and rectification comes from the bottom—not from the top. It comes from the masses of struggling human beings, It comes from the instinctive efforts of millions of human hearts trying to beat their way up into the light and into the hope of the future.

Parties are reformed and governments are corrected by the impulses coming out of the hearts of those who never exercised authority and never organized parties. Those are the sources of strength, and I pray God that these sources may never cease to be spiritualized by the immortal subjections of these words of inspiration of the Bible.

If any statesman sunk in the practices which debase a nation will but read this single book he will go to his prayers abashed. Do you not realize, ladies and gentlemen, that there is a whole literature in the Bible? It is not one book, but a score of books. Do you realize what literature is? I am sometimes sorry to see the great classics of our English literature used in the schools as text-books, because I am afraid that little children may gain

the impression that these are formal lessons to be learned. There is no great book in any language, ladies and gentlemen, that is not the spontaneous outpouring of some great mind or the cry of some great heart. And the reason that poetry moves us more than prose does is that it is the rhythmic and passionate voice of some great spirit that has seen more than his fellowmen can see.

I have found more true politics in the poets of the English-speaking race than I have ever found in all the formal treatises on political science. There is more of the spirit of our own institutions in a few lines of Tennyson than in all the text-books on government put together:

"A nation still, the rulers and the ruled,  
Some sense of duty, something of a faith,  
Some reverence for the laws ourselves have made,  
Some patient force to change them when we will,  
Some civic manhood firm against the crowd."

Can you find summed up the manly, self-helping spirit of Saxon liberty anywhere better than in those few lines? Men afraid of nobody, afraid of nothing but their own passions, on guard against being caught unaware by their own sudden impulses and so getting their grapple upon life in firm-set institutions, some reverence for the laws themselves have made, some patience, not passionate force, to change them when they will, some civic manhood firm against the crowd. Literature, ladies and gentlemen, is revelation of the human spirit, and within the covers of this one book is a whole lot of litera-

ture, prose and poetry, history and rhapsody, the sober narration of the ecstasy of human excitement—things that ring in one's ears like songs never to be forgotten. And so I say, let us never forget that these deep sources, these wells of inspiration, must always be our sources of refreshment and of renewal. Then no man can put unjust power upon us. We shall live in that chartered liberty in which a man sees the things unseen, in which he knows that he is bound for a country in which there are no questions mooted any longer of right or wrong.

Can you imagine a man who did not believe these words, who did not believe in the future life, standing up and doing what has been the heart and center of liberty always—standing up before the king himself and saying, "Sir, you have sinned and done wrong in the sight of God and I am his messenger of judgment to pronounce upon you the condemnation of Almighty God. You may silence me, you may send me to my reckoning with my Maker, but you cannot silence or reverse the judgment." That is what a man feels whose faith is rooted in the Bible. And the man whose faith is rooted in the Bible knows that reform cannot be stayed, that the finger of God that moves upon the face of the nations is against every man that plots the nation's downfall or the people's deceit; that these men are simply groping and staggering in their ignorance to a fearful day of judgment and that whether one generation witnesses it or not, the glad day of revelation and of freedom will come in which men will

sing by the host of the coming of the Lord in His glory, and all of those will be forgotten, those little, scheming, contemptible creatures that forgot the image of God and tried to frame men according to the image of the Evil One.

You may remember that allegorical narrative in the Old Testament of those who searched through one cavern after another cutting the holes in the walls and going into the secret places where all sorts of noisome things were worshipped. Men do not dare to let the sun shine in upon such things and upon such occupations and worship. And so I say there will be no halt to the great movement of the armies of reform until men forget their God, until they forget this charter of their liberty. Let no man suppose that progress can be divorced from religion, or that there is any other platform for the ministers of reform than the platform written in the utterances of our Lord and Saviour.

America was born a Christian nation. America was born to exemplify that devotion to the elements of righteousness which are derived from the revelations of Holy Scripture.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have a very simple thing to ask of you. I ask of every man and woman in this audience that from this night on they will realize that part of the destiny of America lies in their daily perusal of this great book of revelations—that if they would see America free and pure they will make their own spirits free and pure by this baptism of the Holy Scripture.



## INTERNATIONAL CONCILIATION

NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER

Excerpts from opening address of Nicholas Murray Butler, the presiding officer at the Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration, 1910.

No well-informed observer is likely to deny that the cause which this conference is assembled to promote has made important progress during the past year. The several striking incidents which mark that progress—including, in particular, the identic circular note of Secretary Knox bearing date October 18, 1909, proposing the investment of the International Prize Court with the functions of a court of arbitral justice, and the hearty approval which the proposal has met; the public declaration of President Taft, made in New York on March 22, 1910, that there are no questions involving the honor or the interests of a civilized nation which it may not with propriety submit to judicial determination; the action of the Congress in making an appropriation for the Bureau of the Interparliamentary Union for the Promotion of International arbitration, thus committing the United States Government officially to that admirable undertaking; and, finally, the forthcoming submission to the arbitral tribunal at The Hague of the century-old controversy between Great Britain and the United States as to the New-

foundland fisheries—all these will be fully recounted here in the course of our present meeting. To those who are impatient for the attainment of our ideal we can only say that progress toward it is steadily making and that the chief forces now at work in the world, political, economic, and ethical, are co-operating with us to bring about its attainment. To those who fear that we may make progress too fast and that some measure of national security will be sacrificed in pushing forward to establish international justice, we can only say that justice is itself the one real and continuing ground of security for both men and nations, and that heretofore in the history of mankind the devil has always been able to take care of his own cause without the necessary aid and comfort of the forces in the world that are aiming at the overthrow of the rule of any power but right. . . . .

There is a type of citizen who must be mentioned, because the type is numerous, influential, and important. This is the type which holds the view that, of course, international arbitration is a thing greatly to be desired; of course, we must all hope for the day when that at present distant, impracticable, and wholly praiseworthy ideal shall be reached; but that, until that day—which is probably to be the Greek Kalends—we must continue to tax our great modern industrial nations, struggling as they are under the burdens of popular education, and of economic and social betterment, in order that death-dealing instrumentalities may be increased

and multiplied, and the several nations thereby protected from invasion and attack. This procedure, so the curious argument runs, is to hasten the coming of international arbitration and to promote it. Civilized men, it appears, are to be shot or starved into agreeing to arbitrate.

This point of view requires for adequate treatment not the arguments of a logician, but the pencil of a Tenniel or the caustic wit of a Mr. Dooley. Look at the situation in the world to-day as this type of man presents it to us. Of course, the United States is a peaceful nation; of course, Great Britain is a peaceful nation; of course, Germany and France and Japan are peaceful nations; but, therefore, because they propose to attack nobody they must so strengthen their defenses, so multiply their navies, and increase their armies that nobody can successfully attack them. Who, pray, is left to attack these peaceful and law-abiding nations if, as we are assured by everybody—both leaders of governments, the moulders of public opinion and the substantially unanimous press of the world—they do not propose to attack each other, unless it be an army of white bears from the newly-discovered North Pole or a procession of elephants and camelopardals from the jungles of Central Africa? The gullibility of mankind was never more conclusively demonstrated than by the widespread acceptance of this huge joke, which, unlike most other jokes, has to be paid for at a literally stupendous price. Children must go untaught, sani-

tary inspection and regulation must go unprovided, better workingmen's dwellings must be postponed, provisions for recreation and enlightenment must be put off, conditions accompanying labor, poverty and old age must go indefinitely without amelioration, in order that in this twentieth century men and nations, who, looking in the glass, call themselves intelligent and practical, may support, maintain, and propagate this stupendous joke! Either the whole world is being deluded by a witticism of cosmic proportions or some important persons are conspiring to tell an awful lie.

One of the earliest questions recorded in history is the petulant query of Cain, "Am I my brother's keeper?" On the answer to this question all civilization depends. If man is not his brother's keeper, if he may slay and rob and ravage at will for his own advantage, whether that be personal or national, then civilization becomes quite impossible. It is vain to attempt to divert us by analogies drawn from the past history of the race. Mankind has been climbing upward and neither standing on a level nor going down hill. Acts, policies and events which are easily explainable and in large part defensible in other days and under other conditions are neither explainable nor defensible now. The twentieth century cannot afford to receive its lessons in morals, whether personal or national, from the fifteenth or the sixteenth. We are our brothers' keepers and they are ours. The whole world has become a brotherhood of fellow-citizens. The bar-

riers of language are slowly breaking down; wars of religion are almost unheard of; distance in space and time has been practically annihilated by steam and electricity; trade is as easy today between New York and Calcutta or between London and Hong Kong as it once was between two neighboring shops in the bazaars of Damascus on either side of the street called Straight. What possible reason is there why the fundamental principles which civilization applies to the settlement of differences between individuals cannot now be applied to the settlement of differences between nations?

The United States has done so much to educate world opinion in the past century and a half that we may well be ambitious for it to do still more. We have shown that to all appearances a federal form of government, extended over a wide area and embracing many competing and sometimes conflicting interests, is practicable, and that it can survive even the severe shock of civil war. We have shown that under the guidance of a written constitution, judicially interpreted, there is room for national growth and expansion, for stupendous economic development, for absorption into the body politic of large numbers of foreign born, and for the preservation of civil liberty over a considerable period of time. Suppose now that during the next few decades it might be given to us to lead the way in demonstrating to the world that great sovereign nations, like federated states, may live and grow and do business together in harmony and unity,

without strife or armed conflict, through the habit of submitting to judicial determination all questions of difference as they may arise, the judicial decree when made to be supported and enforced—after the fashion in which judicial decrees are everywhere supported and enforced—by intelligent public opinion and by an international and neutral police. Might we not then be justified in believing that the place of our beloved country in history was secure?

What more splendid foundation could there be upon which to build an enduring monument to the American people than their guarantee and preservation of civil liberty, together with national development at home, and their leadership in establishing the world's peace, together with international development all around the globe? Dare we leave anything undone to put our own land in the place of highest honor by reason of its contribution to the establishment of the world's peace and order and happiness through the rule of justice—a rule accepted because it is just and bowed down to because it is right? What picture of glory and of honor has the advocate of brute force to offer us in exchange for this?

The great movement in which we are engaged is all part and parcel of a new way of life. It means that we must enter with fulness of appreciation into the activities and interests of peoples other than ourselves; that we must always and everywhere emulate the best they have to teach us and shun

the worst; that we must answer in no uncertain tones that we are our brothers' keepers; and that, as with men so with nations, the path of justice, of integrity, and of fair dealing is the true path of honor. Let us see to it that we Americans tread steadily in it.



## FUTURE IN CHEMISTRY

WILDER D. BANCROFT

An address by Professor Wilder D. Bancroft at the dedication of the Chemistry Building of the College of the City of New York, May 14, 1908.

The future in chemistry! No two people agree as to what the future development of chemistry is to be, and it is probable that any one man would give you a different answer if the question were put to him at an interval of five years. Depending on whom you ask, you will be told that the really important thing is organic chemistry, inorganic chemistry, physical chemistry, electrochemistry, photochemistry, physiological chemistry, industrial chemistry, or what not. I could even name one man who has believed all these things at one time or another. It is easy to see that predictions like these are the results of opinion that exists. The same diversity of opinion as to what is fundamentally important appears very clearly when we remember that the Carnegie Institution is not making any large grant to chemistry, for the simple reason that the chemists of the country cannot agree as to what problem or group of problems should be attacked. My task to-day is to point out to you what the real future of chemistry will be and

to make you see that my prophecy is the one that will come true.

We shall reach our goal most quickly by what is at first sight an indirect way. At the dedication of a chemical, physical, engineering, geological, biological, or medical laboratory, it is customary to have addresses, even as now; and it is the orthodox thing to say the most important of all the sciences is the science to be studied in that laboratory, whether it be chemistry, physics, engineering, geology, biology, medicine, or something else. I sympathize fully with the practice and I intend to do the same thing myself to-day. You will admit, however, that the people who make addresses of this type at the dedication of laboratories cannot all be right when they talk like that. Some of them must be exaggerating just a little, and in order to acquit the chemist of any such a charge, we must first consider the relation of chemistry to the other sciences.

We will define chemistry as a study of all properties and changes of matter depending on the nature of the substances concerned. This definition is wider than the usual one. It is one that I have used for years, and it is one which Sir William Ramsay suggested but did not make in his "Introduction to the Study of Physical Chemistry." It follows from this definition that physics is a subdivision of chemistry; an important and interesting subdivision, it is true, but only a subdivision. Chemistry includes all of what is known as physics except

the law of gravitation, the laws of motion, and a few other abstract formulations. Everything else that gives life and interest to physics is chemistry pure and simple. I admit that this point of view is not popular among my colleagues, the physicists, but their objections are natural enough without being valid. Physics was a flourishing science at the time when chemistry, in the narrower sense of the word, was of very little importance. In the case of anything that is expanding and developing, it seems to me axiomatic that you must have the part before we have the whole, and that in the first stages the part will seem the whole. In 1600 the men of Great Britain were the whole of the Anglo-Saxon race. To-day they are only a part of it; an important part, it is true, but only a part. Let us try another illustration. As children we were told that "great oaks from little acorns grow." If you only have the acorn, of course, it is the important thing; but later one sees that the acorn is merely an interesting subdivision or product of the oak, and that is all it is. We may, therefore, class physics as a subdivision of chemistry.

When we come to engineering, it is clear that we are dealing with applied chemistry. If it were not for the specific properties of iron, copper, concrete, brick, etc., and of all the other materials of engineering, there would be no such subject as engineering. Speaking in a broad sense we may say that engineering is the art of making the structural properties of matter useful to man.

Geology is the study of the chemistry of the earth. This has been recognized for a long time, and though we speak of the Geophysical Laboratory at Washington, its work is geochemical in fact, though not in name.

In biology of the present and future we are interested in the chemical changes in the living organisms due to heredity and environment. Growth is a chemical change. The internal and external structures of plants and animals are the result of a series of chemical changes. After the first stage of identification, enumeration, and classification has been passed, the interests of the biologist are essentially chemical, and the quality of his work is likely to increase as his methods become chemical. The work of Loeb in California is a striking instance of what may happen when a biologist realizes that his subject is a subdivision of chemistry.

In curative medicine we are dealing largely with the action of drugs. In preventive medicine we are dealing with inoculations, diet, exercise, and fresh air. In the first case we are checking and eliminating an abnormal process, sickness, by the action of one set of chemicals on the system. In the second case we are preventing the occurrence of a disturbing chemical process, sickness, by the action of another set of chemicals on the system. Owing to the difficulties involved and to the number of variables concerned, our knowledge of the chemistry of medicine is not yet what it should be; but it is clear that real progress will be made just in so far as we

study physiology and medicine as subdivisions of chemistry. I cite as an instance the brilliant work of Arrhenius in the field of immuno-chemistry.

I have tried to show you that physics, engineering, geology, biology, and medicine are all subdivisions of chemistry. My task is over. The future in chemistry will consist in the change from chemistry as a coördinate science to chemistry as the dominant science. With this in mind, can you wonder at the fascination which chemistry has for the chemist? Now you will see why I rejoice that to-day the world is to be the better for a well-equipped laboratory in the hands of a well-equipped staff.



## THE UNIVERSITY IS A DEMOCRACY

NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER

An address delivered at the installation of Edwin Anderson Alderman as President of the University of Virginia, April 13, 1905, by Nicholas Murray Butler, representing the universities of the North.

Ladies and Gentlemen,—One of the most charming of the shorter Dialogues of Plato has for its subject friendship. After subtle and amusing discussions, you will remember, Socrates and his two young friends profess themselves unable to discover what is a friend! If fools may rush in where angels fear to tread, shall we not say that intimate association, complete confidence, and intellectual sympathy are the sure bases of friendship between men? Then are we met to-day—some of us, I know, many of us, no doubt—to hail a friend, to bid him God-speed, and to stand at his side while he publicly consecrates himself to the service of an ideal. And than that ideal there is none loftier or more noble. It is the service of truth and of mankind, surrounded by all the uplift, all the vigor, and all the opportunity of our American democracy.

The human brain has conceived no finer career than that offered by a university in a democracy. No longer do universities, however beautiful their fabric, content themselves with “whispering from

their towers the last enchantments of the Middle Age," for they must busily explain to a new age the manifold enchantments of its own making. No longer do universities, however ancient their traditions, carefully shun the practical, for they must ceaselessly teach that the truly practical is but the embodiment of those everlasting principles which have been since the world began. The shackles, too, are gone—the shackles theologic, the shackles philosophic, the shackles scientific. The truth *has* made us free.

Our political liberty and our university freedom grew up side by side. The same promptings of the spirit that brought to pass the one gave us also the other. It is worth minding, too, that it was not blind passion, but untamed and reckless force, but reflective thought that sowed the seeds of both. Moreover, political liberty and university freedom have this in common—the making of men. Tyranny and censored thinking may conceivably make a man or two now and then, but they could never make men. And men, real men, with disciplined minds, with finely formed and tempered characters, with the power to grow by serving, are the best product of the ages; for with our political liberty and our universities does freedom exist.

Consider for a moment what it is that our democracy demands of its universities. It demands a detachment which judges fairly, without an aloofness that fails to sympathize. It demands a progressiveness which presses forward without a pace that

leaves appreciation breathless. It demands a scholarship which is solid and sure, without a pedantry that is sterile and suffocating. It demands a historic sense which interprets the present by the past, without an ancestor-worship that bows the head in contemplative awe. It demands a catholicity of spirit which bars no excellence without a superficial sentimentality that stops short of having convictions. Out of these elements is the atmosphere of a university compounded—detachment, progressiveness, scholarship, historic sense, catholicity. Is it possible for a democracy to pay too much honor to its universities? What life is better than a life which helps a university on its way?

It is trite to say that universities are among the oldest of human institutions, yet it is worth repeating now and then. Universities are older than parliamentary government, older even than our familiar spoken tongues; they are but a little younger than the Roman law and the Roman Church. Stately, then, they are, and wise with watching many men and many moods, as well as useful and skilful, too, both to inquire and to teach. In the beginning the universities never doubted the validity of their method; it was an all-conquering syllogistic logic. To-day the universities are little given to doubt the validity of that scientific method which has displaced the syllogistic. It may be well for the confident modern to remember the errors of the equally confident scholar of the Middle Age and to profit by his example, if possible. If,

as Socrates said, an unexamined life is not worth living, then surely an uncriticised method abounds in danger. The university that does not persistently examine the validity of its method; that does not question its assumptions; that does not, in other words, pay to philosophy its just and necessary due, will not remain a university long.

To a university in a democracy you come, old friend, as counselor and guide. The task is not a new one to your head and hand. Yonder in the old North State, and across the mountains in the Crescent City, where the mighty father of waters halts for a moment before ending his winding course, you have taken the reins and driven skilfully the chariot of scholarship and of service. To-day the scene is new. Here are fine traditions, noble ideals, brilliant achievement. May the passing years bring only glory to the nation's University that is set in the Old Dominion's crown, and which bears her splendid name, and only happiness and honor to the President, to whom to-day with high hope and sincere affection we bid Godspeed.

## INAUGURAL ADDRESS

GEORGE E. VINCENT

George E. Vincent, President of the University of Minnesota, succeeded Cyrus Northrop in October, 1911. The following speech is abridged from his inaugural address:

The ceremonies of this hour mark not so much the coming of a man as the beginning of a new phase in the life of the university. In the sweep of time most men are merged in the on-going human tide. It is wise, therefore, to look beneath the formal and the personal; to ask what this occasion really means or what it ought to mean.

Of one thing there can be no doubt. This day sees the passing of a personal leadership, although happily not the waning of that personal influence. Not all mortals are destined to be engulfed in the nameless millions of mankind. A few outstanding men cannot be forgotten. "An institution," said Emerson, "is but the lengthening shadow of one man." Minnesota, in this sense, will be the lengthening shadow of Cyrus Northrop. Such unity as the University has found is due almost wholly to the fusing power of his winning and guiding personality. The University stands a living tribute to the quick sympathy, humorous tolerance, harmonizing tact, alert intelligence, and moral earnestness

of its President Emeritus. He had to convince an often skeptical outside public; he had to moderate and adjust keen rivalries within the institution. Colleges and departments sought their own ends with only a faint glimpse of the university as a whole. As he lays down the burden of twenty-seven years he leaves the institution firmly grounded in the good will of the people, and unified by the loyalty of faculty, alumni, and students. We should sadly miss the meaning of this day did we fail to turn our grateful thoughts toward Cyrus Northrop and to wish him many years of serenity and happiness. Unlike Macbeth, he has

“. . . that which should accompany old age,  
As honor, love, obedience, troops of friends.”

To-day the University sets its face toward a new *régimé*. No man can take the unique place of its second president. The burden must rest on many men and women, who, as comrades, take up the task. The gains of the personal ascendancy that has passed must be capitalized. Coöperation, organization, team-play, are keynotes for the coming years. An institutional period is at hand. Loyalty must look to purposes rather than to a person. Leadership will consist in carrying out policies which many have helped to formulate. Regents, faculties, alumni, students—all citizens—must see the institution more vividly as a noble trust to be administered for the common good. This spirit of coöperation can be aroused only by a compelling vision of the

University seen as an organ of the higher life of the Commonwealth. And this ideal must get its setting in some inspiring philosophy of the State.

Mr. H. G. Wells tells us that we, as a nation, suffer from "State blindness." "The typical American," he says, "has no 'sense of the State.' I do not mean that he is not passionately and vigorously patriotic. But I mean that he has no conception that his business activities, his private employments, are constituents in a large collective process; that they affect other people and the world forever, and cannot, as he imagines, begin and end with him."

Even our friendly critic, the British ambassador, takes much the same view. "The State," declares Mr. Bryce, "is not to them (Americans), as to Germans or Frenchmen, and even to some English thinkers, an ideal moral power, charged with the duty of forming the characters and guiding the lives of its subjects. It is more like a commercial company, or, perhaps, a huge municipality created for the management of certain business in which all who reside within its bounds are interested. . . ." This individualistic "stock company" theory of the Commonwealth is neither ennobling in itself nor does it afford a sound basis for a State-supported university. We may paraphrase Mr. Joseph Chamberlin on the British Constitution, and thank God that our institutions are not logical. This philosophy would almost reduce the university to a machine for turning out persons equipped at public expense for getting a living out

of the citizens who had been already taxed to train their exploiters. On this basis it is hard to see why the State should give privileges to a few at the expense of their fellows. Even the "antidote against ignorance" philosophy leaves the imagination cold. This is only a sublimated form of the policeman theory. Obviously we need some other conception of the State if we are to escape cynicism about both our social system and our public higher education.

But we cannot admit that Mr. Wells and Mr. Bryce have quite made out their case. There are signs of change in the feeling of Americans toward the State. Especially in the middle and far West do we note a keener recognition of collective interests and purposes. There is a quickened feeling of team-play, a clearer "sense of the state," which is thought of not in a merely political way, but is looked at as a social life with common aims. The people of a State have learned to work together to protect natural resources, to foster agriculture, to safeguard public health, to regulate industry and commerce, to promote the highways, to care for the defective and dependent, to promote education. They have done these things sometimes through the machinery of government, sometimes through unofficial groups. All this community activity has inevitably changed the picture of the State in the minds of its citizens. The Commonwealth emerges as something far nobler than a stock company run for the profit of its shareholders. It does become

"an ideal moral power," a larger life in which men and women realize more fully their best selves, and to which they give something that will endure for all time. The State is coming to stand for a common life, which seeks to gain ever higher levels of efficiency, justice, happiness, and solidarity.

In a picture like this the State university finds both setting and sanction. It becomes an instrument of the general purpose, a training place of social servants, a counsellor of the Commonwealth, a source of knowledge and idealism. It is this vision which must fascinate and control the men and women who are to-day taking up anew the responsibility for this institution. Arnold Toynbee once said: "Enthusiasm can only be aroused by two things—first, an ideal which takes the imagination by storm; and, second, a definite, intelligible plan for carrying this ideal out into practice." Here is the whole philosophy of successful effort. Many an ideal comes to naught because it lacks the right means of expression. Many a well-laid plan misses the emotional energy aroused by a vision. Emerson's Oxford don whose philosophy read, "Nothing new, nothing true, and no matter," was not of those who bring things to pass. We do well to-day to catch a glimpse if we can of the university that ought to be, with the hope that it may "take our imaginations by storm" and urge us to devise "definite and intelligible" plans for action. . . . .

Let us glance rapidly at the chief things that combine in the university ideal which we would fix

in our minds to-day. If the phrase "glittering generalities" dampens our ardor, we may take courage from Emerson's spirited retort, when Choate applied these words to the lines of the Declaration of Independence: "Glittering generalities!" cried the Sage of Concord, "they are blazing ubiquties!"

The picture of the State as a collective life, which seeks common ends by concerted effort, makes the State university a means of social efficiency and progress. The older individualistic theory no longer satisfies even those who put their faith in private initiative and responsibility. The university aims first of all to serve the Commonwealth through individuals, not to offer personal privilege at State expense. Alma Mater is of a Spartan type, and trains her sons and daughters for work and for life. She must teach the robust gospel that "It is the one base thing to receive and not to give." She must insist that "Life is not a cup to be drained, but a measure to be filled." For the old aristocratic ideal of *noblesse oblige* she substitutes the sentiment *largesse oblige*. Acceptance of public aid may make a pauper or an ingrate or a loyal servant of the State. If tax-supported higher education is to be justified, it must see itself and make the people see it as an instrument of the common life, and not an agency of privilege.

The first president of Johns Hopkins University was fond of saying that buildings are but the shell of the university; its real life lies in its men. He was proud of the fact that at the very outset an

eminent physicist like Rowland used a kitchen as his laboratory. Only great men and women can make a university great. Better inspired investigators and teachers in barracks than a staff of industrious mediocrity in marble palaces. Best of all, alert, well-trained, high-minded scholars in serviceable buildings with adequate equipment. If, however, a choice must be made, it should never hesitate between men and materials. The university which is true to its ideals will draw and hold an able staff by salaries that banish petty anxiety, by freedom from drudgery, by opportunities for research and public service, and by dignifying recognition. No institution that thinks of investigators and teachers as employees is likely to secure any but the drudges of the profession.

“Enthusiasm for truth, that fanaticism of veracity,” which Huxley deemed “a greater possession than much learning” is the very life of a true university. . . . . No ingenious machinery of scholarship, no mere pedantry which, as a wit has said, “never takes a step without leaving a footnote,” can take the place of the genuine passion for new truth. The ideal university will not deceive itself or others by any perfunctory simulation of research. It will seek men who have the dauntless “fanaticism of veracity.”

“The teaching at the ideal university, declares Birrell, “is without equivocation and without compromise. Its notes are zeal, accuracy, fullness, and authority.” It is hard to keep the functions of teach-

ing and investigation in equal honor. Where research is exalted, instruction is too often lightly esteemed. The "mere teacher," as the patronizing phrase runs, suffers in rank and salary and social status. In the university of our dreams the noble calling of imparting truth, stimulating reflection, and kindling enthusiasm will be held in high repute. But the two types will not be too sharply contrasted, for he who teaches "with zeal, accuracy, fullness, and authority" must refresh himself constantly at the sources of knowledge, while no man who pushes forward the frontiers of science can fail to impart with zest to at least a small group of followers the new truth that he has discovered. The two types must hold each other in respect and honor, and both must be held up for admiration by their colleagues.

In an ideal university students should be treated not as subjects, but as citizens of the republic of letters and science. Students have not always been in pupilage. Frederick Barbarossa conferred such powers upon the students of Bologna that they not only lorded it over the townfolk, but we are told "reduced the latter (professors) to a position of humble deference to the very body they were called upon to instruct." To admit students to academic citizenship, however, is not to surrender to them control of the university. It is simply to emphasize their share in the community life; to fix upon them responsibility and to afford that training in corporate self-control—the selection of leaders, the

creation of standards, the conformity to these—which is the very essence of democracy. The university must hark back to the mediaeval ideal of a “*Universitas magistrorum et studentium*”—a corporation of teachers *and* scholars. The alumni, too, must feel themselves a part of this corporation. They do not, as at the English universities, legally control, but actually they have great power and responsibility. They will not be mere praisers of the past, and resent change because the memories of their undergraduate days have been embalmed in sentiment. On the contrary, they will often take the initiative in new movements. They will report impressions gathered as they mingle with the people of the State; they will feel not only free, but in duty bound to make suggestions; they will make it a point to know what the university is aiming at, and will help to interpret the institution to the State. The alumni will frequent the only lobbies that the university can afford to enter, the daily converse of citizens and the agencies of publicity. And all this the alumni can do effectively only through an organization which will coöperate heartily with the other members of the university community.

If a people is not to perish mentally and spiritually, it must be steadily refreshed by streams of thought and idealism. Of these, the university strives to be a perennial source. Unless graduation is a mockery, hundreds of men and women go forth each year to diffuse throughout the Commonwealth

the ideas and attitude toward life which they gained from their college training. The value of all this must be as real as it is intangible. Mathew Arnold has described the effect of such diffusion of ideas in speaking of "this knowledge turning a stream of fresh and free thought upon our stock notions and habits, which we now follow staunchly, but mechanically, vainly imagining that there is a virtue in following them staunchly, which makes up for the mischief of following them mechanically." If a State is to be flexible and escape the bonds of habit and custom, it must be constantly revivified. In this service the university must play a leading part. . . . .

To find exceptional men and women, to train them for service, to fit them for leadership, to fill them with zeal for truth and justice, is the one great aim of the university. "The mind which keeps the mass in motion," said Godkin, "would most probably, if we could lay bare the secret of national vigor, be found in the possession of a very small proportion of the people, though not in any class in particular, neither among the rich nor the poor, the learned nor the simple, capitalists nor laborers. . . . ."

From the university towers the searchlights must be ever sweeping countryside, village, town, and city for the "minds which keep the mass in motion."

Standards of truth, skill, taste, efficiency are the capitalized experience of society, essential to stability and progress. Of these standards, the university

is one of the guardians. To these, come what may, it must be true. No sympathy for individuals, no pressure of influence, no fear of retaliation, no desire for numbers must weaken fidelity to standards. Freedom of research, freedom of teaching, high ideals of productive scholarship and of professional integrity, conscientious and fearless appraisal of students' work are of vital concern to the university and to the State it serves. To help to refine and raise these standards, to adjust them more nicely to social needs, to fix these values in public opinion, is a duty of the ideal university.

In the striking phrase of President Van Hise, the university must aim at being the "expert advisor of the State." How stirring the thought of a well organized and efficiently manned center of knowledge, skill, and wisdom, holding itself at the disposal of every constructive interest and activity of the community, and ready to concentrate upon their problems the sifted experience of all the world. In this responsiveness the true university expresses its purpose and spirit. It is a bureau of information, the stored memory of civilization, an alert investigator of new facts; it is a friendly and at the same time a disinterested counsellor. It is pathetic to see men, isolated from the wisdom of the centuries and of their own times, hopefully assailing the ever recurring problems of life. The waste of effort, the futility of duplicating errors, cry out for aid. The opportunities for service multiply with each year. We are coming to realize that good farming is no

longer a robbing, but a recompensing of the soil; that it costs as much to plant bad seed as good; that sometimes cows are pensioners instead of producers; that bad highways are the heaviest road tax; that cheap schools are the most expensive; that public health is national capital; that juvenile delinquency comes less from depravity than from deprivation; that industrial accidents are not lawyers' perquisites, but costs of production; that all idleness is not due to indolence; that social legislation is not an amiable avocation, but an exacting profession; that municipal government should not be so skilfully designed to prevent bad men from doing harm, that it keeps honest and efficient men from doing good; that the United States must trust less to a "manifest destiny" and more to a constructive purpose. In these changes of theory and method there is need of accurate knowledge, carefully interpreted experiment, and authoritative advice. If the university is true to its mission, it will put all of its resources and its trained experts at the service of the community. Amid the conflicts and rivalries of many interests, parties, sects, sections, professions, social groups, the university must never waver from the position of an unimpassioned, unprejudiced seeker for the truth, all of it, and that alone. This responsibility is not to be assumed lightly. Mistakes are costly in public confidence. Eternal vigilance is the price of prestige. The discomfiture of the expert gives joy to the average citizen. The ideal university must, therefore, be

true to the most rigorous laws of scientific method if the institution is to gain and hold its place as the "expert advisor of the State." . . . . .

We have caught glimpses of the university ideal. May this, as the years pass, grow ever clearer, nobler, more inspiring. May it take our "imaginactions by storm," not as an evanescent emotion, but as a persistent vision. We remember Toynbee's words, "a definite intelligible plan for carrying that ideal out into practice." It is to the many details of this plan that as colleagues we are to address ourselves. May we take up this great task with a solemn sense of what it means. We must not deceive ourselves. We advance to no easy triumphs. We must cherish no millennial dreams. We must have faith that good-will, guided by wisdom, will in the end bring our vision to pass. Let us, then, with sober judgment and steady courage, pledge anew our loyalty to the ideals of the university, to the people of the State, and to that republic of science, letters, and the arts which knows no national boundaries. May each of us take to heart the counsel of Goethe:

"What each day needs, that shalt thou ask;  
Each day will set its proper task.  
Give others' work just share of praise;  
Not of thine own the merits raise.  
Beware no fellow man thou hate;  
And so in God's hands leave thy fate."



## THE DELAYS AND DEFECTS IN THE ENFORCEMENT OF LAW IN THIS COUNTRY

WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT

Parts of an address delivered by William H. Taft before the Civic Forum, in New York City, April 28, 1908.

If one were to be asked in what respect we had fallen farthest short of ideal conditions in our whole government, I think he would be justified in answering, in spite of the failure that we have made generally in municipal government, that the greatest reform which could be effected would be expedition and thoroughness in the enforcement of public and private rights in our courts. I do not mean to say that the judges of the courts are lacking either in honesty, industry, or knowledge of the law, but I do mean to say that the machinery of which they are a part is so cumbersome and slow and expensive for the litigants—public and private—that the whole judicial branch of the government fails in a marked way to accomplish certain of the purposes for which it was created.

In the courts of first instance and in the intermediate appellate courts of the United States there is much more delay than is necessary. In the first place, the codes of procedure are much too elabo-

rate. It is possible to have a code of procedure simple and effective. This is shown by the present procedure in the English courts framed by rules of court. The code of the State of New York is staggering in the number of its sections. A similar defect exists in some civil law countries. The elaborate Spanish code of procedure that we found in the Philippines when we first went there could be used by a dilatory defendant to keep the plaintiff stamping in the vestibule of justice until time had made justice impossible. Every additional technicality, every additional rule of procedure adds to the expense of litigation. It is inevitable that with an elaborate code, the expense of a suit involving a small sum is in proportion far greater than that involving a large sum. Hence, it results that the cost of justice to the poor is always greater than it is to the rich, assuming that the poor are more often interested in small cases and the rich in large ones—a fairly reasonable assumption. In perhaps less than half the cases a jury trial is possible, and necessary if demanded. This adds to the elaborate machinery necessary for the adjustment and decision of the rights of the litigants. It greatly increases the time taken in the disposition of the case, and also the expense attendant on the trial. In the Federal courts, upon demand, a jury trial must be had in all cases at common law involving more than twenty dollars.

One reason for unreasonable delay in the lower courts is the disposition of judges to wait an undue

length of time in the writing of their opinions or judgments. I speak with confidence on this point, for I have sinned myself. In English courts the ordinary practice is for the judge to deliver his opinion immediately upon the close of the argument, and this is the practice which ought to be enforced so far as possible in our courts of first instance. It is a great deal more important that the court of first instance should decide promptly than that it should decide right. Such practice of deciding cases at the close of the hearing makes the judge very much more attentive to the argument during its presentation and much more likely on the whole to decide right when the evidence and the arguments are fresh in his mind. In the Philippines the system has been adopted of refusing a judge his regular monthly stipend unless he can file a certificate, with the receipt for the money, in which he certifies on honor that he has disposed of all the business submitted to him within the previous sixty days. This has had a marvellously good effect in keeping the dockets of the court clear.

One of the great difficulties with the profession of the law—whether the members are judges or advocates—is the disposition to treat the litigants as made for the courts and the lawyers, and not the courts and lawyers as made for the litigants. And as it is lawyers who in judicial committees of the legislatures draft the codes of procedure, there is too frequently not present in as strong impelling force as it ought to be the motive for simplifying

the procedure and making the final disposition of cases as short as possible. In the end, this would be greatly in the interest of the lawyers, because they would have more business. The present conditions of delay in the courts and inability to obtain final decisions within a reasonably short time, lead those who are able to arbitrate their cases out of court and lead many a party to a controversy to yield to unjust claims rather than to expose himself to the nervous strain and expensive burden of a long-drawn-out contest in court.

We have, as is well understood, certain constitutional restrictions as to the procedure in criminal cases which offer protection to the accused and present difficulties in the proof of his guilt to the government. But these obtain as well in the English courts as in our own, and, therefore, their existence does not offer a reason for the delays which we have here and which are absent in the English administration of justice. A murder case, which in this country is permitted to drag itself out for three weeks or a month, in England is disposed of in a day, two days, or, at the most, three days—certainly in less than one-fifth the time. This is because the judges insist upon expedition by the counsel, cut short useless cross-examination, and confine the evidence to the nub of the case. It is due to the greater power which the English judge is given, in accordance with the common law rule, as to the respective functions of the court and jury. With such speed, it would be possible for the prosecuting attorneys

to clear their dockets, whereas now they are utterly unable to do so. A man who is indicted and has means with which to secure bail is released on bond, unless he is confined for murder in the first degree. The pressure upon the prosecuting officers is for the trial of those who are in jail and unable to give bail, and the result usually is that there is but little time for the trial of those who are released on bail; so continuances are granted from time to time in the bailed cases, the evidence fades and disappears, newer and more sensational cases come on, and ultimately nollies are entered, and the indicted man escapes. This is the explanation why so many crimes are not punished. Much of the difficulty and failure of justice would be avoided if greater expedition were used in the cases which are tried.

Another cause of delay is the difficulty of securing jurors properly sensible of the duty which they are summoned to perform. In the extreme tenderness the State legislatures exhibit toward persons accused as criminals, and especially as murderers, they allow peremptory challenges to the defendant in excess of those allowed to the State. In my own State of Ohio for a long time the law was that the State was allowed two peremptory challenges and the defendant twenty-three in capital cases. This very great discrepancy between the two sides of the case allowed the defendant's counsel to eliminate from all panels every man of force and character and standing in the community, and to assemble a

collection in the jury box of nondescripts of no character, weak, and amenable to every breeze of emotion, however maudlin or irrelevant to the issue.

One very salutary provision which ought to be introduced into the statutes of every State and the statutes of the United States in regard to appeals in criminal cases, and indeed in regard to appeals in civil cases, would be that no judgment of a trial court should be reversed except for an error which the court, after reading the entire record, can affirmatively say would have led to a different verdict and judgment. This would do no injustice and would end reversals for technicalities.

And, now, what has been the result of the lax administration of criminal law in this country? Criminal statistics are exceedingly difficult to obtain. The number of homicides one can note from the daily newspapers, the number of lynchings, and the number of executions, but the number of indictments, trials, convictions, acquittals, or mistrials it is hard to find. Since 1885 in the United States there have been 131,951 murders and homicides, and there have been 2,286 executions. In 1885 the number of murders was 1,808. In 1904 it had increased to 8,482. The number of executions in 1885 was 108. In 1904 it was 116. This startling increase in the number of murders and homicides as compared with the number of executions tells the story. As murder is on the increase, so are all offences of the felony class, and there can be no doubt that they will continue to increase unless the

criminal laws are enforced with more certainty, more uniformity, more severity than they now are.

I freely admit that the strongest force in a community like this is the force of public opinion, and that frequently the existence of evils in the community is due to the fact that the force of public opinion is not sufficiently directed to the evil in hand. The enormous discrepancy between the crimes which are committed and the crimes which are actually brought to trial is sufficient to show that the force of public opinion is not acute enough and is not directed against the prosecuting officers and the judicial officers with sufficient vigor to bring every man guilty of an offence to trial. Of recent years we have been engaged in the trial of wealthy men and corporations charged with violating the anti-trust laws and the anti-rebate laws, or laws against railway discrimination. In the trials which have ensued there has been brought home to the public the possibility of contest offered to wealthy defendants who employ acute counsel to take advantage of all the technicalities and delays which the laws at present in force offer. It is quite possible that the escape of wealthy malefactors under our present criminal system from just punishment will bring home to the people at large the conviction which ought to obtain, that in the tenderness toward the individual charged with crime manifested by legislatures and lawmakers during the last fifty years in this country, great injustice has been done to the interests of the public and that is a time for the calling of a halt.



## THE INDETERMINATE SENTENCE, THE PAROLE, AND THE NEW CRIMI- NOLOGY

FREDERICK HOWARD WINES

Parts of an address by Frederick Howard Wines, before the Chamber of Commerce, Springfield, Ill., March 2, 1910.

Criminology is the science and art of dealing with crime and criminals. The new criminology is the natural and inevitable reaction against the old, against the penal codes and penal establishments, which it is its aim to replace by others more in harmony with modern intelligence and civilization.

The indeterminate sentence and the parole, or conditional liberation, though separable in thought and in law, are vitally related to each other as component parts of an advanced prison system; the attempt to sever them from each other would resemble the rejected proposal to cut the bond that united the Siamese twins lest it should prove fatal to one or both. The indeterminate sentence is the central feature of the new criminology.

As an advocate of the new criminology, I shall endeavor to demonstrate that the abandonment in Illinois of the indeterminate sentence, which would necessarily follow a successful attack upon the parole law, would be a retrograde step in the onward march of science and of religion.

It is now very nearly half a century since my father, the acknowledged leader of prison reform throughout the world, the founder of the national prison association and of the international penitentiary congress, awakened my interest in the prison question. When I consider the state of American prisons then and the advance that has been made since, I am moved to exclaim, with Hamlet, "Look here, upon this picture, and on this;" or, in the words of the first telegram sent over the line between Baltimore and Washington, "What hath God wrought."

There were at that time three great wrongs that loudly called for redress; political control of prisons, contract labor in prisons, and the undue frequency and severity of disciplinary punishments. The profits of the system went to the contractor and the political leader; the convict was its helpless victim.

Convict labor is unwilling labor. In order to render it profitable, coercion in some form is indispensable. The system seemed to justify and demand the application of brute force, and it was sometimes applied in forms which recall to mind the tortures of the Spanish Inquisition. . . . .

At last it dawned upon the consciousness, even of the men by whom the system was administered, that human conduct is regulated by two opposite motives, of which one—namely, fear, is brutalizing and degrading, but the influence of hope is on the contrary inspiring and uplifting. It was decided to try the effect of rewards instead of punishments

as an inducement to industry and obedience. Two forms of reward suggested themselves. The first of these was the grant to the prisoner himself of a share in his earnings; the second, the promise of some abridgment of his term of incarceration. The latter took originally the form of commutation of sentence, on a fixed scale, regulated by law. The immediate influence of this innovation was to render the administration of discipline far more easy, and its former harshness was greatly ameliorated. Commutation of sentence as a legal right had a tendency to awaken some degree of self-respect in the prisoner's mind, whereas commutation, as a favor, and still more a pardon given as an act of arbitrary grace, exerts a demoralizing influence, which extends to the entire prison population. But commutation implies absolute discharge; and in this particular it differs from conditional release or the parole, under which the convict is still in legal custody, though at large, and is liable at any time to be re-arrested and imprisoned in case he violates the conditions attached to his parole.

These commutation acts, however, and the experience had of their beneficial tendency, did much to prepare the way for the ultimate acceptance of the principle of the indeterminate sentence.

There is not, and in the nature of things there cannot be, any aid to a truly reformatory discipline like that afforded by the indeterminate sentence. Every prison official can testify to the dissatisfac-

tion and unrest caused by the palpable inequality of sentences; an inequality which neither the legislature nor the courts can avoid or correct. The only equal sentence is the indeterminate sentence, with an identical maximum for all who violate a given section of the code, coupled with identical conditions by which to reduce it to the minimum prescribed by law. Its imposition removes all ground for complaint on this score. It also puts an end to the fallacious hope of an unconditional pardon. The prisoner is given to understand that the date of his release on parole depends entirely upon himself. The authorities desire his release and will help him to earn it; they are not his enemies, but his friends. This disarms him of his hostility to them.

The hope of an early release sustains him under the depressing influence of prison life and stimulates him to exert himself to avoid losing whatever he has gained by diligence and good conduct. He is aided to form habits of industry and obedience, which tend to become fixed. He is trained and transformed.

Under the indeterminate sentence, the prison itself undergoes a gradual process of transformation. The moment that reformation, rather than punishment, becomes the watchword of the administration, a new spirit takes possession of it. The governor chooses better and abler men to govern it—men imbued with reformatory ideas and qualified

to exert a reformatory influence; men of higher education, purer moral character, broader culture, loftier aims in life, greater devotion to their work.

Nor must we fail to take account of the effect of parole on the discharged prisoner. Under the old system, the gate of the prison shutting him out of the prison exerted a depressing effect upon his mind comparable only to that of the same gate, months or years before, shutting him in. Now he leaves the prison with a new hope. He goes to a home prepared to receive and welcome him. He has money in his pocket and the assurance of an opportunity to earn an honest living. During the time of his probation he is watched, encouraged, warned, steadied by the consciousness that failure on his part to make good will render him liable to re-arrest and re-imprisonment. His chances in life are a hundredfold better than under a definite sentence and an absolute discharge.

As a matter of statistical fact, the average term of detention of bad and dangerous men is longer under the indeterminate than under the definite sentence, so that society is better protected under the new system than it was under the old; and those whose conduct shows a less degree of moral turpitude are sooner restored to citizenship and the ranks of productive, self-supporting wage-earners. A judge who has been for twenty-four years upon the bench of the Circuit Court of Illinois declares that, since the passage of the indeterminate sentence act of 1897, he has had occasion to sentence but four

men a second time for any crime, whereas in his earlier experience he resentenced not less than one hundred, and some of them three or four times. In four years' time in the office of State's attorney of Sangamon county, Mr. Hatch, a member of this club, whom you all know and highly esteem, knows of the return of but two to the penitentiary of this State for violation of the conditions of their parole.

No, gentlemen, it is only by reason of ignorance, prejudice, or selfish interest, that this law is opposed, and attempts made to repeal it, or so to amend it as to destroy its efficiency for good. Should any such effort prove successful, but it will not, the hand upon the dial-plate of the clock which marks the advance in civilization would move backward. We might have cause to apprehend the return of the night of the dark ages, a return to the lash, the dungeon, the ball and chain, the rack, the thumb-screw, and all the hideous paraphernalia of an age in which tyrants sought by violence to stifle the yearnings of the human race for freedom and equal rights.

## THE HONOR SYSTEM

JESSE H. HOLMES

A chapel speech by Jesse H. Holmes, Ph. D., Professor of Philosophy in Swarthmore College.

There is a saying that "ability is not the measure of responsibility, but responsibility is the measure of ability." The power to assume responsibility is of more importance than intellectual acuteness. Undoubtedly many of the men who surrounded Washington were more brilliant in intellectual power than Washington himself. It was Washington's capacity to lead that made him a great man as compared with his contemporaries. This does not mean merely that he assumed responsibility for his own conduct. On the contrary, he assumed responsibility for the conduct of many others.

In the life of the college, as well as in the life of the nation, the value of the student and the character of the student is indicated by his willingness to assume responsibility not only for his own conduct, but also for that of the college at large. I am saying this in connection with the discussion of the honor system. As a matter of fact, there are only two systems possible in dealing with examinations. These are the "honor" system and the "dishonor" system. A student does not cheat to himself

alone. A cheating student dishonors his whole class and lowers the tone of the whole college. He cheapens the degree of every student who graduates from the college. In my judgment, it is the duty of the students of this college to see to it that no dishonest paper ever goes into the hands of an instructor. This does not mean that the student must tell the instructor of the dishonest work, but it does mean that he is to make it impossible for the dishonest student to receive credit for stolen work, or to remain permanently in the college.

## JACKSON DAY DINNER

WOODROW WILSON

A speech delivered by Woodrow Wilson at the Jackson Day Dinner of the Democratic party in Washington, January 8, 1912.

Mr. Toastmaster and Fellow Democrats: We are met to celebrate an achievement. It is an interesting circumstance that principles have no anniversaries. Only the men who employ principles are celebrated upon occasions like this and only the events to which their concerted action gave rise excite our enthusiasm. You know that the principles of the Democratic party are professed by practically the whole population of the United States. The test of a Democrat is whether he lives up to those principles or not. I have no doubt there are some people in the United States who covertly question the doctrines of Democracy, but nobody challenges them openly. It goes without saying, therefore, that we have not come together merely to state the abstract principles of our party. We have come together to take counsel as to how it is possible, by courageous and concerted action, to translate them into policy and law. The Democratic party has had a long period of disappointment and

defeat, and I think that we can point out the reason. We do not live in simple times. We live in very conflicting times indeed. No man can be certain that he can say how to weave the threads of Democratic principle throughout all the complicated garment of our civilization, and the reason that the Democratic party has had this period of successive disturbance is that it has been divided into groups just as it was to the method of fulfilling the principles.

We have differed as to measures; it has taken us sixteen years and more to come to any comprehension of our community of thought in regard to what we ought to do. What I want to say is that one of the most striking things in recent years is that with all the rise and fall of particular ideas, with all the ebb and flow of particular proposals, there has been one interesting fixed point in the history of the Democratic party, and that fixed point has been the character and the devotion and the preachings of William Jennings Bryan.

I, for my part, never want to forget this: That while we have differed with Mr. Bryan upon this occasion and upon that in regard to the specific things to be done, he has gone serenely on pointing out to a more and more convinced people what it was that was the matter. He has had the steadfast vision all along of what it was that was the matter, and he has, not any more than Andrew Jackson did, not based his career upon calculation, but has based it upon principle.

Now, what has been the matter? The matter has been that the government of this country was privately controlled and that the business of this country was privately controlled; that we did not have genuine representative government and that the people of this country did not have the control of their own affairs.

What do we stand for here to-night and what shall we stand for as long as we live? We stand for setting the government of this country free and the business of this country free. The facts have been disputed by a good many sections of the Democratic party for the last half generation, but they were not clearly recognized.

I make the assertion that the government was privately controlled. I mean, to put it specifically, that the government of this country was managed by politicians, who gained the contributions which they used by solicitation from particular groups of business interests on the understanding, explicit or implied, that the first care of the government was to be for those particular interests. I am not questioning either the integrity or patriotism of the men concerned. I have no right to. In most instances they were of that old belief, cropping up again and again in America, that the people of this country are not capable of perceiving their own interest and of managing their own affairs; that they have not the contact with large affairs; that they have not the variety of experience which qualifies them to take charge of their own affairs. It is the old Hamil-

tonian doctrine that those who have the biggest asset in the government should be the trustees for the rest of us; that the men who conduct the biggest business transactions are the only men who should stand upon an elevation sufficient to see the whole range of our affairs, and that if we will but follow their leadership we may share in their prosperity. That is the Republican doctrine, and I am perfectly willing, as a tribute to their honesty, though not to their intelligence, to admit that they really believe it; that they really believe it is unsafe to trust such delicate matters as the complicated business of this country to the general judgment of the country. They believe only a very small coterie of gentlemen are to be trusted with the conduct of large affairs. There was a long period in New Jersey, for example, in which no commissioner of insurance was ever chosen without first consulting or getting the consent of the head of the largest insurance company in the State, and I am willing to admit, at any rate, for the sake of argument, that it was supposed he, better than anyone else, knew who was qualified for the job. He did know who was qualified for the job and he had the proper point of view in demonstrating that it was mainly for the benefit of the big interests.

Now, the other thing that has been privately controlled in this country is the business of the country. I do not mean that each man's particular business ought not to be privately controlled, but I mean that

each man's particular business ought not to be privately controlled, but I mean that the great business transactions of this country are privately controlled by gentlemen whom I can name and whom I will name, if it is desired; men of great dignity of character; men, as I believe, of great purity of purpose, but men who have concentrated, in their own hands, transactions which they are not willing to have the rest of the country interfere with.

Now, the real difficulty in the United States, it seems to me, is not the existence of great individual combinations—that is dangerous enough in all countries—but the real danger is the combination of the combinations, the real danger is that the same groups of men control chains of banks, systems of railways, whole manufacturing enterprises, great mining projects, great enterprises for the developing of the natural water power of this country, and that threaded together in the personnel of a series of boards of directors is a community of interest more formidable than any conceivable combination in the United States.

It has been said that you cannot “unscramble eggs,” and I am perfectly willing to admit it, but I can see in all cases before they are scrambled that they are not put in the same basket and entrusted to the same groups of persons.

What we have got to do—and it is a colossal task—a task not to be undertaken with a light head or without judgment—but what we have got to do is to disentangle this colossal community of in-

terest. No matter how we may purpose dealing with a single combination in restraint of trade, you will agree with me in this: that I think no combination is big enough for the United States to be afraid of; and when all the combinations are combined, and this combination is not disclosed by any process of incorporation or law, but is merely the identity of personnel, then there is something for the law to pull apart, and gently, but firmly and persistently, dissect.

You know that the chemist distinguishes between a chemical combination and an amalgam. A chemical combination has done something which I cannot scientifically describe, but its molecules have become intimate with one another and practically united, whereas an amalgam has a mere physical union created by pressure from without. Now, you can destroy that mere physical contact without hurting the individual elements, and you can break up this community of interest without hurting any one of the single interests combined; not that I am particularly delicate of some of the interests combined—I am not under bonds to be unusually polite, but I am interested in the business of this country, and believe its integrity depends upon this dissection. I do not believe any one group of men has vision enough or genius enough to determine what the development of opportunity and the accomplishments by achievement shall be in this country. You can't establish competition by law, but you can take away the obstacles by law that stand in the way of

competition, and while we may despair of setting up competition among individual persons, there is good ground for setting up competition between these great combinations, and after we have got them competing with one another they will come to their senses in so many respects that we can afterwards hold conference with them without losing our self-respect.

Now, that's the job. That's the thing that exists, and the thing that has to be changed, not in any spirit of revolution and not with the thought—for it would be a deeply unjust thought—that the business men of this country have put up any job on the government of this country. Take even that colossal job known as the Paine-Aldrich tariff. The business men of this country did not put up that job! Some of the business men of this country did, but by no means all of them. Think what that means! Do you mean to say that the commercial men of this country are interested in maintaining the integrity of that bill? Some and only some of the manufacturers of this country have put up that job on us, and many of them have been the unwilling beneficiaries of a system which they knew did not minister to the prosperity of their undertakings.

I am not going to make a tariff speech. It is so easy to knock holes in the present tariff there is no sport in it. I am a humane man. I wouldn't jump on a thing like that, but I do want to point out to you that the ownership of government—it is a harsh word to use, but I am not using it harshly, I am

using it for shorthand—the ownership of the government of the United States, by special groups of interests, centers in the tariff, and that's where the difference comes in. I have heard men say that politicians interfered too much with business. I want to say that business men interfere too much with politics. Do the statesmen of this country go to the Ways and Means Committee and the Finance Committee and beg for these favors? You know that they do not. Some Congressmen go to these committees and plead that some gentlemen back in their constituencies are pressing them hard on bills, and as public men, plead for individual interests, and their entrance into politics has been so by those who intended to control the schedules of the tariff.

I once heard a very distinguished member of Congress give this illustration: He was talking about a great campaign fund that had been collected. It was the paltry sum of \$400,000. It was a great sum for that somewhat primitive day, and it was pointed out at the time—at any rate specified—that most of this money had been contributed by manufacturers, who were the chief beneficiaries of the tariff, and those gentlemen pointed out that they certainly would want to get their money back. I may not be saying the thing properly, but it is simply this:

Down where I live we get most of our water from pumps, and a pump, as you know, may go dry over night, and a prudent housekeeper will pump up a bucket of water at night before she goes to bed and

leave it standing. Then in the morning, if the plunger won't suck, she pours in that water and that expands the plunger and it begins sending the pump water out, and the first water that comes out is the same water she poured in. By that I mean, gentlemen, that this \$400,000 was ordered poured in to make the old pump suck, and you know that that homely illustration is fair. That's what is done and that's the way the control of government comes in.

Well, what are we going to do? I have a practical mind and am not interested particularly in the too-long-winded discussion of the principles upon which we are going to act. Neither am I wise enough to propose a comprehensive program. I think the rule of Donnybrook Fair is good enough for me: "Hit the heads you see." Make sure before that your shillalas are made of good Irish hickory. By that I mean this: Lop off the special favors whenever you are certain you have identified them; lop them off. That's a pretty good rule. You don't need to be all-wise to do that. Paint some of those favors so conspicuously that all can see them. If you don't know which they are, ask the first man you meet on the street and he will tell you. He will give you a list that will keep you busy all winter. And I might add this, if you please: not to go at them haphazard, but to go steadily through the things that have become obvious excrescences and cut them off. That's a very definite program, and then I might add: go into an absolutely thorough

investigation of the way it may best be conducted, find out just where, in dissecting, the scalpel can be introduced, and divorce these artificial unions, because I know that you will not be cutting living tissue.

I hear a great deal of talk about conservatism and radicalism. Now, what makes a man shiver when he hears a statement of the facts concerning it? He feels it is cold-blooded and indiscreet to state the facts, and yet he really is inclined, I must say, to think there is something in it. He says to himself: This man must be a radical, because if he sees the thing that way, what, in God's name, is he going to do, because, if he is going to go to work to thoroughly change those facts there is no telling where he will stop. Now, it is just there that he ought to stop being radical. If the prudent surgeon wants to save the patient he has got absolutely to know the naked anatomy of the man. He has got to know what is under his skin and in his intestines; he has got to be absolutely indecent in his scrutiny. And then he has got to say to himself: "I know where the seat of life is; I know where my knife should penetrate; I dare not go too far for fear it should touch the fountain of vitality. In order to save this beautiful thing I must cut deep, but I must cut carefully; I must cut out the things that are decayed and rotten, the things that manifest disease, and I must leave every honest, wholesome tissue absolutely untouched." A capital operation may

be radical, but it is also conservative. There cannot be life without the cutting out of the dead and decayed tissue.

And as to business, after a few committees like the Stanley Committee have gone on a little longer we will know a good many particulars, and we will be versed in this high finance business ourselves. These things are coming out with astonishing candor. We now know how to regulate prices. We know how to run combinations by circulars that convey intimations and instructions. We see the little artificial threads that bind these things together, threads which do not themselves contain the life, but which themselves do control the vessels in which the life blood runs. And so stage by stage we shall learn what the practical business of a Democrat is. It is to go to the root of the matter, seek out the processes of cure and restoration and rehabilitation. What a travesty it is upon the name of Democracy to see any Democrat who wishes to destroy the very thing that his principles should make him in love with—namely, the life of the people themselves. A very thoughtful preacher pointed out the other day that one of the first quotations in our Lord's Prayer is "Give us this day our daily bread," which would seem, perhaps, to indicate that our Lord knew what every statesman must know, that the spiritual life of the nation cannot exist unless it has physical life; that you cannot be an altruist and patriot on an empty stomach. Nothing shows the utter incapacity of a man to be a Democrat so much

as his incapacity to understand what we are after. He does not know that the very seeds of life are in the principles and confidence and lives and virtues of the people of this country, and so when we strike at the trusts, or rather, I won't say strike at the trusts, because we are not slashing about us—when we move against the trusts, when we undertake the strategy which is going to be necessary to overcome and destroy monopoly, we are rescuing the business of this country, we are not injuring it, and when we separate the interests from each other and disconnect these communities of connection, we have in mind a greater community of interest, a vaster community of interest, the community of interest that binds the virtues of all men together, that mankind, which is broad and catholic enough to take under the sweep of its comprehension all sorts and conditions of men, and that vision which sees that no society is renewed from the top and every society is renewed from the bottom. Limit opportunity, restrict the field of originative achievement, and you have cut out the heart and root of the prosperity of the country itself.

The only thing that can ever make a free country is to keep a free and hopeful heart under every jacket in it, and then there will be an irrepressible vitality, then there will be an irrepressible ideal which will enable us to be Democrats of the sort that when we die we shall look back and say: "Yes, from time to time we differed with each other as to what ought to be done, but after all we followed

the same vision, after all we worked slowly, stumbling through dark and doubtful passages onward to a common purpose and a common ideal." Let us apologize to each other that we ever suspected or antagonized one another; let us join hands once more all around the great circle of community of counsel and of interest, which will show us at the last to have been indeed the friends of our country and the friends of mankind.



## THE ISSUES OF REFORM

WOODROW WILSON

Address of Woodrow Wilson at the banquet of the Knife and Fork Club of Kansas City, Mo., May 5, 1911.

There can be no mistaking the fact that we are now face to face with political changes which may have a very profound effect upon our political life. Those who do not understand the impending change are afraid of it. Those who do understand it know that it is not a process of revolution, but a process of restoration, rather, in which there is as much healing as hurt. There are strain and peril, no doubt, in every process of change, but the chief peril comes from undertaking it in the wrong temper. It lies not in the change itself so much as in the method of some of those who promote it. It is a noteworthy circumstance that in proportion as the people of the country come to recognize what it is that renders them uneasy and what it is that is proposed by way of reformation they lose their fear and take on a certain irresistible enthusiasm.

The American people are naturally a conservative people. They do not wish to touch the stable foundations of their life; they have a reverence for the rights of property and the rights of contract which is based upon a long experience in a free life, in

which they have been at liberty to acquire property as they pleased and bind themselves by such contracts as suited them. No other people have ever had such freedom in the establishment of personal relationships or property rights. They do not mean to lose this freedom or to impair any rights at all, but they do feel that a great many things in their economic life and in their political action are out of gear. They have been cheated by their own political machinery. They have been dominated by the very instrumentalities which they themselves created in the field of industrial action. The liberty of the individual is hampered and impaired. They desire, therefore, not a revolution, not a cutting loose from any part of their past, but a readjustment of the elements of their life, a reconsideration of what it is just to do and equitable to arrange in order that they may be indeed free, may indeed make their own choices, and live their own life undominated, unafraid, unsuspicuous, confident that they will be served by their public men, and that the open processes of their government will bring to them justice and timely reform.

What we are witnessing now is not so much a conflict of parties as a contest of ideals, a struggle between those who, because they do not understand what is happening, blindly hold on to what is and those who, because they do see the real questions of the present and of the future in a clear, revealing light, know that there must be sober change; know that progress, none the less active and determined

because it is sober and just, is necessary for the maintenance of our institutions and the rectification of our life. In both the great national parties there are men who feel this ardor of progress and of reform, and in both parties there are men who hold back, who struggle to restrain change, who do not understand it or who have reason to fear it. . . . .

Both parties are of necessity breaking away from the past, whether they will or no, because our life has broken away from the past. The life of America is not the life it was twenty years ago. It is not the life it was ten years ago. We have changed our economic conditions from top to bottom, and with our economic conditions has changed also the organization of our life. The old party formulas do not fit the present problems. The old cries of the stump sound as if they belonged to a past age, which men have almost forgotten. The things which used to be put into the party platforms of ten years ago would sound antiquated now. You will note, moreover, that the political audiences which nowadays gather together are not partisan audiences. They are made up of all elements and come together, not to hear parties denounced or praised, but to hear the interests of the nation discussed in new terms—the terms of the present moment.

We have so complicated our machinery of government, we have made it so difficult, so full of ambushes and hiding places, so indirect, that instead of having true representative government we

have a great inextricable jungle of organization intervening between the people and the processes of their government; so that by stages, without intending it, without being aware of it, we have lost the purity and directness of representative government. What we must devote ourselves to now is, not to upsetting our institutions, but to restoring them.

Undoubtedly we should avoid excitement and should silence the demagogue. The man with power, but without conscience, could, with an eloquent tongue, if he cared for nothing but his own power, put this whole country into a flame, because the whole country believes that something is wrong and is eager to follow those who profess to be able to lead it away from its difficulties. But it is all the more necessary that we should be careful who are our guides. The processes we are engaged in are fundamentally conservative processes. If your tree is diseased it is no revolution to restore to it the purity of its sap, to renew the soil that sustains it, to reestablish the conditions of its health. That is a process of life, of renewal, of redemption.

There is no ground for alarm, therefore. We are bent upon a perfectly definite program, which is one of health and renewal.

Let us ask ourselves very frankly what it is that needs to be corrected. To sum it all up in one sentence, it is the control of politics and of our life by great combinations of wealth. Men sometimes talk as if it were wealth we were afraid of, as if we

were jealous of the accumulation of great fortunes. Nothing of the kind is true. America has not the slightest jealousy of the legitimate accumulation of wealth. Everybody knows that there are hundreds and thousands of men of large means and large economic power who have come by it all perfectly legitimately not only, but in a way that deserves the thanks and admiration of the communities they have served and developed. But everybody knows also that some of the men who control the wealth and have built up the industry of the country seek to control politics and also to dominate the life of common men in a way in which no man should be permitted to dominate.

In the first place, there is the notorious operation of the bipartisan political machine: I mean the machine which does not represent party principle of any kind, but which is willing to enter into any combination, with whatever group of persons or of politicians, to control the offices of localities and of States and of the nation itself in order to maintain the power of those who direct it. This machine is supplied with its funds by the men who use it in order to protect themselves against legislation which they do not desire, and in order to obtain the legislation which is necessary for the prosecution of their purposes.

The methods of our legislatures make the operations of such machines easy and convenient, for very little of our legislation is formed and effected by open debate upon the floor. Almost all of it is

framed in lawyers' offices, discussed in committee rooms, passed without debate. Bills that the machine and its backers do not desire are smothered in committee; measures which they do desire are brought out and hurried through their passage. It happens again and again that great groups of such bills are rushed through in the hurried hours that mark the close of the legislative sessions, when every one is withheld from vigilance by fatigue, and when it is possible to do secret things.

When we stand in the presence of these things and see how complete and sinister their operation has been we cry out with no little truth that we no longer have representative government.

Among the remedies proposed in recent years have been the initiative and referendum in the field of legislation and the recall in the field of administration. These measures are supposed to be characteristic of the most radical programs, and they are supposed to be meant to change the very character of our government. They have no such purpose. Their intention is to restore, not to destroy, representative government. It must be remembered by every candid man who discusses these matters that we are contrasting the operation of the initiative and the referendum, not with the representative government which we possess in theory and which we have long persuaded ourselves that we possessed in fact, but with the actual state of affairs, with legislative processes which are carried on in secret, responding to the impulse of subsidized machines,

and carried through by men whose unhappiness it is to realize that they are not their own masters, but puppets in a game.

If we felt that we had genuine representative government in our State legislatures no one would propose the initiative or referendum in America. They are being proposed now as a means of bringing our representatives back to the consciousness that what they are bound in duty and in mere policy to do is to represent the sovereign people whom they profess to serve and not the private interests which creep into their counsels by way of machine orders and committee conferences. The most ardent and successful advocates of the initiative and referendum regard them as a sobering means of obtaining genuine representative action on the part of legislative bodies. They do not mean to set anything aside. They mean to restore and reinvigorate, rather.

The recall is a means of administrative control. If properly regulated and devised, it is a means of restoring to administrative officials what the initiative and referendum restore to legislators—namely, a sense of direct responsibility to the people who chose them.

The recall of judges is another matter. Judges are not lawmakers. They are not administrators. Their duty is not to determine what the law shall be, but to determine what the law is. Their independence, their sense of dignity and of freedom, is of the first consequence to the stability of the State.

To apply to them the principle of the recall is to set up the idea that determinations of what the law is must respond to popular impulse and to popular judgment. It is sufficient that the people should have the power to change the law when they will. It is not necessary that they should directly influence by threat of recall those who merely interpret the law already established. The importance and desirability of the recall as a means of administrative control ought not to be obscured by drawing it into this other and very different field.

The second power we fear is the control of our life through the vast privileges of corporations which use the wealth of masses of men to sustain their enterprise. It is in connection with this danger that it is necessary to do some of our clearest and frankest thinking. It is a fundamental mistake to speak of the privileges of these great corporations as if they fell within the class of private right and of private property. Those who administer the affairs of great joint stock companies are really administering the property of communities, the property of the whole mass and miscellany of men who have bought the stock or the bonds that sustain the enterprise. The stocks and the bonds are constantly changing hands. There is no fixed partnership. Moreover, managers of such corporations are the trustees of moneys which they themselves never accumulated, but which have been drawn together out of private savings here, there, and everywhere.

What is necessary in order to rectify the whole

mass of business of this kind is that those who control it should entirely change their point of view. They are trustees, not masters, of private property, not only because their power is derived from a multitude of men, but also because in its investment it affects a multitude of men. It determines the development or decay of communities. It is the means of lifting or depressing the life of the whole country. They must regard themselves as representatives of a public power. There can be no reasonable jealousy of public regulation in such matters, because the opportunities of all men are affected. Their property is everywhere touched, their savings are everywhere absorbed, their employment is everywhere determined, by these great agencies. What we need, therefore, is to come to a common view which will not bring antagonisms, but accommodations. The programs of parties must now be programs of enlightenment and readjustment, not revolutionary, but restorative. The processes of change are largely processes of thought, but unhappily they cannot be effected without becoming political processes also, and that is the deep responsibility of public men. What we need, therefore, in our politics is an instant alignment of all men free and willing to think, and to act without fear upon their thought.

This is just as much a constructive age in politics, therefore, as was the great age in which our Federal government was set up, and the man who does not awake to the opportunity, the man who does not sacrifice private and exceptional interests in order

to serve the common and public interest, is declining to take part in the business of a heroic age. I am sorry for the man who is so blind that he does not see the opportunity, and I am happy in the confidence that in this era men of strength and of principle will see their opportunity of immortal service.

I am not one of those who wish to break connections with the past, nor am I one of those who wish change for the mere sake of variety. The only men who do that are the men who want to forget something, the men who filled yesterday with something they would rather not recall to-day. Change is not interesting unless it is constructive, and it is an age of construction that must put fire into the blood of any man worthy of the name.

## AFTER-DINNER SPEECH

STRICKLAND W. GILLILAN

By Strickland W. Gillilan, before the Ohio Society, Philadelphia, March 30, 1912.

I shall begin by omitting something. That which an after-dinner speaker omits is far more vital than what he emits. I shall omit the customary statement that I am glad to be here. That statement is usually made to cover embarrassment. And while it might cover an embarrassment of ordinary acreage, it wouldn't make a patch on mine at this moment. Besides, I have made that statement so often, perfunctorily, only to find out afterwards that I was alone in my joy over my presence, that I have eliminated it permanently from my stock come-packed banquet speech.

Circumstances have taught me caution in regard to public utterances. Why, even in this city of brotherly affection and other dispelled illusions and broken-down traditions, not longer than two months ago—on St. Groundhog's day, to be exact—a friend of mine arose in the presence of the bread and caviar of hospitality and, yielding to a sudden and uncontrollable (but typewritten) burst of emotion, hurled contumely and other verbal missiles and débris at the newspapers until he suc-

ceeded in pinning the Indian sign on his own glowing presidential prospects. And while I have no presidential prospects that my physician could detect the last time I uneasily requested him to stethoscope me, yet one can never tell.

Forewarned is forearmed, and while four-armed is in one sense quadrupedalian (see Webster) it does not necessarily mean making an ass of one's self. So I shall keep my fingers firmly closed, and try not to queer any chances I may be entertaining unawares. I am the one American citizen who has never been mentioned for the job.

Not that I want to be President. That is almost as painful and unnatural as being right. But one should keep one's lightning rods upright and greased and properly insulated. I am intending to take the extreme precaution, the year preceding the next national attack of presidential epilepsy, to write a confidential letter to some friend whom I can safely entrust with the delicate—not to say sacred—task of violating said confidence at the phychological moment, declaring that I positively and finally and irrevocably refuse to be a candidate for the highest office, unless I can manage in some way to sandbag the nomination. That ought to fix things.

The ideal banquet speech is one that subtracts heavily from the sum-total of human knowledge. If one says something wise and deep, it is said obscurely and misunderstood; or said too clearly, and somebody is peeved and begins slinging mud. One

should say nothing; say it clearly, firmly, and stand by it. Being misunderstood is a terrible thing. Being understood by the boxes when we play to the galleries is worse. One should sterilize his talk, denature it, disinfect it of meaning and thought germs. Then if the newspapers credit you with having said anything at all, your reputation has something on your character. Most banquet speakers say nothing, but don't know it. I say nothing intentionally. That marks clearly the difference between a fool and a humorist.

Again, there are public speakers who say nothing in such an impressive way that it sounds as if it might assay about \$500 to the ton. But when some cruel listener smelts it or free mills it or applies the cyanide, we are surprised at the poverty of the result. Few banqueters carry their stamp mill or bottle of cyanide with them, and the bluff goes uncalled. Nobody remembers what the speaker said. They know the tune, but not the words. It is flap-doodle de luxe, piffle plenipotentiary, yet it has the auricular effects of oratory. It is grand opera in a defunct language.

There are men who, with distended eyeballs, glistening fangs, disheveled locks, wilted collar, varicose brow veins, vermillion neck, and deep lavender visage, can beat upon the table until the silver hits the ceiling, the dishes break the chandeliers, and the salt-cellars are all upset for bad luck, and declare with a scream of rage through foamy lips that the reason the Sahara Desert is in its present

deplorable condition is a lack of moisture. They say this boldly, recklessly, defiantly, declaring by their halidomes that they care not what effect this committing of themselves on this burning issue may have upon their political prospects. Yet even such speeches have been known to move strong men (with weak minds) to tears and nominations.

Such speeches make us mere professional smile-smiths emerald with envy. But such speakers, thank God, are scarce and becoming scarcer. They are the goosebone weather prophets, the leech doctors of the spoken word. They have augured so many trite auguries that their mouths have become literal auger-holes and their speeches bores.

The time is coming—though it is not here or I should be elsewhere to-night—when even at a banquet a man must say something, shut up, sit down, or all three. But by that stage of the millenium, banquets themselves will have been relegated to the lost limbo of Salem witch pyrography and other outworn and barbaric practices.

## APPENDIX I

---

### SYNOPSIS

For the use of students in preparing and criticising speeches, the following questions should prove helpful:

#### I. Introduction.

1. Is it needed to win the good will of the audience?
2. Does it set forth the speaker's theme clearly?
3. Will it arouse interest in what is to follow?

#### II. Discussion.

1. Does it have (a) Unity?  
(b) Logical Order?  
(c) Clearness?  
(d) Force?  
(e) Elegance?  
(f) Appeal?
2. Is it convincing?

#### III. Conclusion.

1. Is it the natural climax of the speech? or
2. Is its purpose merely that of leave-taking?
3. Is it brief?
4. Is it strong?
5. Is it appropriate?



## APPENDIX II

---

### TOPICS FOR SPEECHES

These topics are selected from lists submitted by the heads of departments in Swarthmore College for the use of students majoring under them. They aim to be suggestive rather than specific, and in many cases must be narrowed to a theme suitable for a five-minute talk. College topics and questions arising in class-room discussions are freely used and recitation periods are occasionally given over to the discussion of some general topic.

In all cases the topics chosen must be submitted and approved a week in advance of the recitation.

#### **Economics**

1. City Play-grounds.
2. City Planning.
3. Compensation for Industrial Accidents
4. Causes for Present High Prices.
5. Work of a Clearing-House.
6. The Conservation Movement.
7. The Menace of Immigration.
8. Socialism.
9. Need for Public Health Measures.
10. Scientific Management in Business.

11. Corporation Tax (see *Journal Pol. Econ.*, Vol. 18, pp. 62-473).
12. Physical Valuation of Railroads (see *Journal Pol. Econ.*, Vol 16, p. 189).

### Astronomy

1. Surface of the Moon.
2. Corona of the Sun.
3. Canals of Mars.
4. Nebulæ
5. The Spectroscope.
6. Paths of Comets.
7. The Evening Sky.
8. Sun Spots.

### Biology and Geology

1. Mimicry in Animals.
2. The Coral Reefs.
3. Immigration of Birds.
4. Protective Coloration.
5. Harmful Insects.
6. The Gipsy Moth.
7. Factors in Distribution of Animals.
8. What the Weather-Man Does.
9. The Sea Bottom.
10. Factors Affecting Climate.

### Chemistry

1. Rubber, Its Sources and Treatment.
2. The Tanning of Leather.
3. Methods of Preserving Wood.

4. Manufacture of Sugar.
5. Manufacture of Celluloid.
6. Properties of Radium.

### **French**

1. The Church and State Conflict.
2. Morocco.
3. French Colonial Empire.
4. Modern French Art.
5. Student Life.
6. The Code Napoleon.
7. The Depopulation Question.

### **History**

1. Themistocles' Dream for Athens.
2. Rome and Christianity.
3. The Crusaders.
4. Rise of the Italian Cities.
5. Franklin's Poor Richard Philosophy.
6. The Winning of the West.
7. The Fall of Feudalism.
8. Wolsey in Fact and Fiction.
9. Oliver Cromwell.

### **English**

1. Ibsen's Women.
2. Macbeth and Lady Macbeth—Comparison and Contrast.
3. My Favorite Novelist.
4. George Eliot.
5. Plays of Stephen Phillips.

6. Tremendous Trifles.
7. Symbolism of Maeterlinck.
8. Dorothy Wordsworth's Journal.
9. Mill's Doctrine of Liberty.
10. Johnson's Plays.
11. The Lake Poets.

### Engineering

1. Oil Engineers. Reference—Cassier's, March, 1911.
2. Reclaiming the Everglades. Reference—Cassier's, March, 1911.
3. Corrosion of Metals. Reference—Mech. Engineer, Jan. 20, 1911.
4. Ventilating Tunnels. Reference—Eng. News, March 2, 1911.
5. World's Debt to Wireless. Reference—Tech. World, March, 1911.
6. Wood Block Paving. Reference—Eng. News, April 27, 1911.
7. Paving and Road-Making. Reference—Principal Eng., Feb., 1911.
8. Garbage Collection and Disposal. Reference—Principal Eng., Feb., 1911.
9. Power Plant Practice. Reference—Industrial Eng., Feb., 1911.
10. Training of Workmen. Reference—Industrial Eng., Feb., 1911.
11. The Automobile Industry. Reference—Automobile, Feb. 2, 1911.

12. Rational Road Regulations. Reference—Automobile, Feb. 2, 1911.
13. Aeroplane vs. The Battleship. Reference—Pop. Mech., Dec., 1910.
14. Management of Men. Reference—Wood Workers, Jan., 1911.
15. Warm Cement Floors. Reference—Cement Age, Jan., 1911.



## APPENDIX III

---

The "Public Speaking Review" has an interesting and helpful department on Extemporaneous Speaking, under the editorship of Professor J. A. Winans, Cornell University. From the department the following extracts are made:

### EXTEMPORE SPEAKING IN HIGH SCHOOLS

Not long ago the writer was invited by the principal of one of the leading high schools of this State to hear a program by that school's students when brought together for an hour's assembly. The theme was Shakespeare. Those on the program were, as we recall, from an advanced English class. Some of the subjects they chose to speak upon were:

1. "A Plea for Shylock."
2. "Shakespeare's Women."
3. "The Foremost Man of All the World."
4. "Lady Macbeth and Portia, a Comparison and Contrast."

Some of the students musically inclined interspersed these talks with such songs as "Under the Greenwood Tree" and "Who is Sylvia," the singing being prefaced with a few words of explanation.

The talks were short, averaging from three to five minutes in length. They were briefed, not memorized; they were thoughtful and to the point, no declamation or Websterian maneuvers being attempted. The songs, too, were well rendered and at the conclusion we felt as if we had been an hour with Shakespeake.

History, too, affords excellent opportunity for the student to speak before his schoolmates in such assembly, for we are speaking particularly of the average high school where no special instructor in public speaking is employed. To illustrate, let us suppose the class has reached the period of "the Civil War" and is brought face to face with "the foremost American." How interesting and helpful some such program as the following could be made apportioned among different members of the class for one or more exercises:

Story of Lincoln's Early Life.

Lincoln, the Lawyer.

Lincoln's Part in the Black Hawk War.

The Lincoln-Douglas Debates.

Story of Lincoln's Nomination for the Presidency.

Lincoln's Integrity.

Lincoln's Tact.

Lincoln's Appreciation of Humor.

Lincoln's Prose Style.

Reading of Tributes, such as Lowell's and Markham's poems.

The above is meant to be suggestive only, and in no sense exhaustive.

F. E. BROWN,  
*Drake University.*

### NOTES ON PROGRAMS

In submitting the following programs, I have in mind sections of ten members, meeting for a two-hour period once a week or for two hour periods. Each student speaks once a week, and receives two hours of university credit. Speeches have a time limit, usually of five minutes, rarely more than seven. The rest of the time is taken up with impromptu discussions from the floor and criticisms by the instructor, and also frequently by the class. Speeches are based upon outlines prepared in advance and sometimes discussed with the teacher.

The first program here suggested is a rigid requirement, each student being called upon to treat a topic regardless of his preferences. This has an advantage in that one frequently has to do just this in practical work. I frequently say to a complaining student, "Yes, it is an unpromising subject; but there is a speech in there somewhere and it is for you to get it out." But in assigning rigid programs, at least early in the year, I choose a familiar topic, with rather broad themes, such as follows:

### Intercollegiate Athletics

Chairman's address (by a student), Rise of inter-collegiate athletics; Influence of athletics on college life; Should athletes be favored in the classroom? What is professionalism in college athletics? Are we free from professionalism in this college? Should "summer baseball" be permitted? Do athletics cost too much? Is the "new" football an advance? If a member of our team were killed next Saturday, should the schedule be abandoned? Could athletics be maintained without intercollegiate games?

The above program presents too many broad issues; but it will furnish a class of beginners an abundance of material, and consisting largely of live issues on familiar themes will sweep away their diffidence and hesitation. A lively "after-meeting" may be anticipated.

If greater liberty is desired, these topics may be posted for selection. Additional topics will readily occur to all; as, Influence of athletics on students taking part, Can a student be both athlete and scholar? Why is football the great student game? Athletics and the reputation of the university, professional coaches, The season-ticket system, The tax system of support, Is our method of controlling athletics at — democratic enough?

A variation of this method which I have found works well is to read out a list of possible topics with or without brief suggestion of treatment, and let each member express his preference for one of

these or for another which occurs to him. Care must be taken, of course, to reject poor topics and to preserve a degree of unity for the program.

At times I give still larger freedom and assign such a topic as, One reason why —— should be elected. The requirement is simply to choose a definite point and present it clearly and effectively. I have used these in the same way: My point of view on the liquor problem (this may be treated either as a personal or as a social and political question); A single phase of Lincoln's character described and illustrated.

These are but fragmentary suggestions. One of the most important considerations in arranging the exercises of a term is to secure progressiveness, adaptation, and development of the various forms of discourse. I hope we may have some valuable discussion along these lines.

It is not especially difficult to frame programs upon campus subjects, but since it is interesting and frequently helpful to learn what others do I will submit the following, which I have tested with many sections:

### Cheating in Examinations

Chairman's address: Prevalence of cheating in this University.

The moral question involved. [It may be well to assign this to two members, as many fall short of the clear analysis and exposition demanded.]

May one ever conscientiously help another in examination?

The proctor system attacked.

The proctor system defended.

The honor system in the South.

The honor system in Princeton.

The system of the College of Civil Engineering advocated.

The system of the College of Law advocated.

Is an honor system feasible in the College of Arts and Sciences, where election is nearly free, class lines are broken down and public opinion is weak?

Present day students and the sense of honor.

It may be well to assign sub-divisions of some of these topics: as, Does the presence of a proctor justify cheating? Is the analogy between proctor and policeman valid? Is the fact that the dishonorable student may take advantage of an honor system a substantial objection?

J. A. WINANS.

## Intercollegiate Debates I

*Edited by Paul M. Pearson*

The twenty-five debates in the form of briefs and reports are given as actually discussed by prominent students at Harvard, Princeton, Chicago, etc. The substance of each debate is followed by a detailed list of the references consulted by each group of speakers. A college-bred substantialness gives the book weight with mature students. Its simplicity and pointedness make it distinctly helpful to the boy or girl of High School age.

Price per copy \$1.50

## Intercollegiate Debates II

*Edited by E. R. Nichols*

This is a companion volume to the Pearson collection. In the plan of presenting points of main speeches as well as rebuttals in the order recognised as best to-day it is like Volume I. In the debate material it is distinctly individual. Six of the discussions elaborate questions treated in the earlier volume. Two-thirds of the book is devoted to questions that have only recently developed their clutching importance.

Price per copy \$2.00

## Pros and Cons

*Edited by A. H. Craig*

Primarily it is a book of thirty debates employing all arguments on both sides of questions political and social. The organization of societies is explained simply and fully, 250 selected topics for discussion and model addresses for commencements are here. In the abundance and general helpfulness of its data it is first of its class.

Price per copy \$1.50

## The Speaker

*Edited by Paul M. Pearson*

“The Speaker” is a quarterly periodical of such readings, plays, orations and debates as are attracting the attention of college professors and forensic leaders from month to month. The past issues of “The Speaker” in which briefs of debates and bibliographies appear are Nos. 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 19, 21, 23, 24, 27. All kept in stock.

Price per copy: paper, 40c.; cloth, 60c.

One year's subscription (4 numbers) \$1.50

---

HINDS, NOBLE & ELDREDGE, Publishers

New York

Philadelphia

## Questions for Debate

### ABANDONMENT OF PROTECTIVE TARIFF

Sources of data: Pros and Cons, Ch. 15; Intercollegiate Debates, Vol. I, Ch. 5; Intercollegiate Debates, Vol. II, Ch. 3; The Speaker, No. 15.

### AMERICAN IMPERIALISM

Source of data: The Speaker, No. 13.

### ARMED INTERVENTION FOR THE COLLECTION OF DEBTS

Source of data: The Speaker, No. 8.

### CENTRAL BANK

Sources of data: Intercollegiate Debates, Vol. II, Ch. 14; The Speaker, No. 27.

### COMMISSION SYSTEM OF MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT

Sources of data: Intercollegiate Debates, Vol. I, Ch. 24; Intercollegiate Debates, Vol. II, Ch. 8; The Speaker, No. 12.

### CONSERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Sources of data: Intercollegiate Debates, Vol. II, Ch. 5; The Speaker, No. 23.

### THE DIRECT PRIMARY

Sources of data: Pros and Cons, Ch. 23; Intercollegiate Debates, Vol. II, Ch. 9; The Speaker, No. 21.

### EMPLOYER'S LIABILITY FOR ACCIDENTS

Source of data: The Speaker, No. 11.

### FEDERAL AND STATE GOVERNMENT

Sources of data: Intercollegiate Debates, Vol. I, Ch. 2; The Speaker, No. 8.

### FEDERAL CHARTER FOR INTERSTATE BUSINESS

Sources of data: Intercollegiate Debates, Vol. I, Ch. 2; The Speaker, No. 12.

### FIFTEENTH AMENDMENT

Source of data: The Speaker, No. 13.

### FREE RAW MATERIAL

Source of data: Intercollegiate Debates, Vol. II, Ch. 4.

Complete contents of all debate books sent upon request

## **Questions for Debate**

### **GOVERNMENT BY INJUNCTION**

Sources of data: Intercollegiate Debates, Vol. I, Ch. 6; The Speaker, No. 13.

### **GREEK LETTER FRATERNITIES**

Source of data: The Speaker, No. 27.

### **THE INCOME TAX**

Sources of data: Intercollegiate Debates, Vol. II, Ch. 1; The Speaker, No. 11; The Speaker, No. 19.

### **INHERITANCE TAX**

Sources of data: Intercollegiate Debates, Vol. I, Ch. 7; The Speaker, No. 8.

### **THE INITIATIVE AND REFERENDUM**

Sources of data: Pros and Cons; Intercollegiate Debates, Vol. I, Ch. 3; Intercollegiate Debates, Vol. II, Ch. 6; The Speaker, No. 11; The Speaker, No. 24.

### **INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS**

Source of data: The Speaker, No. 27.

### **MUNICIPAL OWNERSHIP**

Sources of data: Pros and Cons, Ch. 28; The Speaker, No. 8; The Speaker, No. 27.

### **THE OPEN SHOP**

Sources of data: Intercollegiate Debates, Vol. I, Ch. 14; Intercollegiate Debates, Vol. II, Ch. 11; The Speaker, No. 15.

### **PRESIDENTIAL VS. PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT**

Sources of data: Intercollegiate Debates, Vol. I, Ch. 19; Intercollegiate Debates, Vol. II, Ch. 12; The Speaker, No. 14.

### **RAILROAD POOLING**

Source of data: The Speaker, No. 19.

### **THE RECALL OF JUDGES**

Source of data: The Speaker, No. 27.

### **RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA**

Source of data: The Speaker, No. 19.

### **THE SHORT BALLOT**

Source of data: Intercollegiate Debates, Vol. II, Ch. 7.

OCT 21 1912







LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



00026436436

